



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

APPENDIX.



- I. PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL SESSION, HARTFORD,
CONN., 1898.
- II. TREASURER'S REPORT (p. iv).
- III. INDEX (p. lxvi).
- IV. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD (p. lxix).
- V. LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS (p. lxxvi).
- VI. CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION (p. xcii).
- VII. LIST OF OFFICERS SINCE ORGANIZATION (p. xciv).
- VIII. PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION (p. xcvi).

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL
SESSION (HARTFORD).

Charles D. Adams, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
James Turney Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y.
J. Edmund Barss, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
C. P. Bill, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
Elizabeth H. du Bois, High School, New York.
Carlton L. Brownson, College of the City of New York, N. Y.
W. S. Burrage, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Mitchell Carroll, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William L. Cushing, Westminster School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Emily H. Dutton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Mortimer Lamson Earle, Barnard College, New York.
Herman L. Ebeling, Miami University, Oxford, O.
W. A. Eckels, Baltimore, Md.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Arthur Fairbanks, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Edwin W. Fay, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
Harold N. Fowler, Western Reserve University (College for Women),
Cleveland, O.
Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Alfred Gudeman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Karl P. Harrington, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. E. Harry, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
H. W. Hayley, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
F. M. Hazen, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Arthur W. Hodgman, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
D. H. Holmes, New York City, N. Y.
H. M. Hopkins, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
J. H. Huddilston, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.
A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
George Dwight Kellogg, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Lida Shaw King, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.
Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Gonzalez Lodge, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
James D. Meeker, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.
Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
J. Leverett Moore, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Edward P. Morris, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
James M. Paton, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Ernest M. Pease, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University,
Cal.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Emma M. Perkins, Western Reserve University (College for Women),
Cleveland, O.
Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Leon J. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Benjamin H. Sanborn, Wellesley, Mass.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
E. G. Sihler, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
H. de Forest Smith, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Frank B. Tarbell, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
John H. Walden, Cambridge, Mass.
Winifred Warren, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Mary C. Welles, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Andrew F. West, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Henry D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Harry Langford Wilson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
J. D. Wolcott, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.
Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 66.]

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

HARTFORD, CONN., July 5, 1898.

The Thirtieth Annual Session was called to order at 3.10 P.M. in the Latin Room at Trinity College, by the President, Professor Minton Warren, of Johns Hopkins University.

The Secretary of the Association, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, of Bryn Mawr College, presented the following report :—

1. The Executive Committee has elected as members of the Association :—

Dr. James T. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Prof. Newton Lloyd Andrews, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Prof. Mark Bailey, Jr., State University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Cecil K. Bancroft, Esq., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Prof. D. M. Birmingham, Napa College, Napa, Cal.
Dr. William S. Burrage, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. J. B. Carter, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Prof. W. H. Crogman, Clark University, Atlanta, Ga.
Arthur Detmers, Esq., Central High School, Buffalo, N. Y.
Miss Elizabeth H. du Bois, Boys' and Girls' High School, 130 East 60th St., New York, N. Y.
Miss Emily Helen Dutton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Prof. F. W. Finke, St. Paul's College, St. Paul Park, Minn.
Dr. J. F. Frisbee, Latin School, Lewiston, Me.
Prof. Newton S. Fuller, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.
Frank Amner Gallup, Esq., Colgate Academy, Hamilton, N. Y.
Prof. Edwin Luther Green, Central University, Richmond, Ky.
H. H. Hilton, Esq., 9 Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.
Dr. David H. Holmes, New York City.
Dr. Herbert M. Hopkins, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Prof. Geo. B. Hopson, St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y.
Dr. J. H. Huddilston, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Dr. Chas. S. Ingham, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Prof. A. P. Keil, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.
Dr. William Hamilton Kirk, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Prof. John J. McCook, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Clarence L. Meader, Esq., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Prof. F. C. Merchant, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.
Prof. S. G. Mitchell, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky.

Prof. Edward Clark Morey, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
 Prof. Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York, N. Y.
 Prof. F. H. Potter, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kan.
 Prof. John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Harry de Forest Smith, Esq., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
 Glanville Terrell, Esq., 17 Trowbridge Place, Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. C. E. Thompson, Ewing College, Ewing, Ill.
 Prof. J. A. Tufts, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
 Miss Mary C. Welles, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 Dr. Harry Langford Wilson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Dr. J. D. Wolcott, Penn Yan, N. Y.
 Prof. E. D. Wright, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.
 Prof. George H. Young, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.

2. The TRANSACTIONS and PROCEEDINGS for 1897 (Vol. XXVIII) were issued in December. Separate copies of the PROCEEDINGS may be obtained of the Secretary or of the publishers.

3. The Report of Publications by members of the Association since July 1, 1897, showed a record of books, pamphlets, and articles by about sixty members.

Professor Smyth then presented his report as Treasurer for the year 1897-98:—

RECEIPTS.	
Balance from 1896-97	\$769.33
Membership dues	\$942.00
Life Membership	50.00
Arrears	240.00
Initiation fees	195.00
Sales of Transactions	251.17
Dividends Central New England and Western R. R. . .	6.00
Offprints	3.80
Interest	15.38
Total receipts for the year	<u>1403.35</u>
	\$2472.68
EXPENDITURES.	
Transactions and Proceedings (Vol. XXVIII) . . .	\$872.51
Committee of Twelve	230.77
Salary of Secretary	250.00
Postage	40.08
Stationery and Job Printing	16.50
Incidental (telegrams, etc.)	4.73
Expressage	1.90
Binding	7.65
Total expenditures for the year	<u>\$1424.14</u>
Balance, July 1, 1898	1048.54
	<u>\$2472.68</u>

The President then appointed the following committees:—

On Officers for 1898–99: Professors Perrin, Lodge, and Tarbell.

On Time and Place of Meeting in 1899: Professors Sihler, Ashmore, and Gudeman.

To audit the Treasurer's report: Professors Merrill and Elwell.

The reading of papers was then begun. At this time there were present about forty members. At subsequent meetings the number was increased to over sixty.

I. Notes on Cicero, *Cato Maior*, by Dr. Charles Knapp, of Barnard College.

I. § 28. *Orator metuo . . . mitis oratio.*

Reid, Meissner, Rockwell, Egbert, and Bennett maintain that *sed tamen* balances *omnino*, a view at first sight most natural, since *omnino . . . sed, omnino . . . sed tamen, omnino . . . autem* are standing combinations (Nägelsbach, *Stilistik*⁸, p. 727). Here, however, the real, logical antithesis is not between the clauses introduced by *omnino* and *sed tamen*. If *omnino* and *sed tamen* were correlative, the ultimate meaning would of course be, 'Though . . . yet,' i.e. we should make Cicero declare the commendatory statement *est decorus . . . oratio* to be true *in spite of* the truth of the *equally commendatory* statement, *canorum illud . . . annos*. Cicero could no more have written this than we could say, 'Though the orator has some good points, his excellences make him commendable.'

So much for negative criticism. Let us now for a moment forget the *omnino*-clause. The other clauses = 'As for the orator, I fear . . . yet after all,' i.e. 'Though, I fear, . . . yet after all.' This arrangement of ideas is unimpeachable, for the commendatory statement, *decorus . . . oratio*, is held to be true *in spite of* the truth of the derogatory statement, *canorum . . . annos*.

Coming now to the *omnino*-clause, we must note that it has to do only with what precedes. Its function is to soften the admission just made, that in one department of activity—oratory—strength diminishes as years increase. It has therefore, in reality, the value of a corrective clause in direct dependence on *metuo . . . languescat*.

Editors have erred because Cicero has not expressed himself with the care requisite to bring out the logical relation of the various elements of his thought. Had he said simply, *orator . . . senectute, quamquam canorum . . . annos*, beginning a new sentence at *sed tamen*, all would have been well. The introduction of *est enim . . . virium*, however, led to a complete change in the structure of the sentence, since a *quamquam*-clause after that, referring back to *orator . . . senectute*, would have been most awkward. Cicero might, indeed, have had recourse to another expedient, namely, that of expressing the thought of *est enim . . . virium* by a causal *cum*-clause preceding *orator . . . senectute*. The *quamquam*-clause might then have been expressed, but the net result of such an arrangement would have been the sacrifice of the powerful effect now gained from the emphatic position of *orator*.

2. § 34. *Ne sint* vs. *non sunt*.

Reid and Bennett write *ne sint* without bestirring themselves especially in defence of their text. Schuckburgh, Meissner, Rockwell, and Egbert give *non sunt*. Of their comments it must suffice to say that they are most inadequate. The fact is, the passage has not received the careful attention it deserves.

If we read *non sunt* we must interpret the words either (1) as a genuine admission that old age has no strength, or (2) as an example of the rhetorical device called *occupatio*. Neither view is at all possible. (1) For seven paragraphs Cato has been arguing most strenuously that there is no appreciable loss of strength in old age. Mark the words which give the upshot of this long discussion: *Potest igitur exercitatio et temperantia etiam in senectute conservare aliquid pristini roboris*. It is simply inconceivable that such a discussion, summed up in such words, should be followed immediately by *non sunt . . . vires*, as a genuine admission of the entire dearth of strength in old age. (2) *Non sunt* cannot be taken as an example of *occupatio*, i.e. as meaning 'But, it may be said,' etc., for (a) this would represent as a brand-new objection a point urged fully three pages back and which has already been amply discussed, and (b) such a form of *occupatio* is without parallel in the *Cato Maior*, perhaps also anywhere in Cicero. In the *Cato Maior* we commonly have *at* in such cases; cf. §§ 21, 33, 35, 47, 65, 68 (bis). For other forms in this dialogue, see Meissner, Anhang II., B. VII. *A rebus gerendis senectus abstrahit* in § 15 is not a parallel to our passage, since it is the context that gives to it the force of 'But, they say,' etc. Cato has just been giving the four complaints against old age, winding up with the words, *Earum . . . causarum quanta . . . videamus*. On *occupatio* in Cicero see Kühner on *Tusc.*, III. § 73, IV. § 52.

To sum up: *non sunt . . . vires* in this context can have no meaning. A further strong argument in favor of *ne sint* is the fact that this reading brings the *method* of Cicero's discussion of the second complaint into perfect harmony with the method employed elsewhere in the dialogue. He is fond of meeting an objection by saying in effect, (1) 'The objection is not well founded'; (2) 'Granting for the sake of argument that the objection is well taken, what of it?' Space is lacking to elaborate this point, but brief reference may be made to two or three examples of the practice. (a) § 4 *Obrepere . . . octogesimum*. (b) In § 27 Cato says *nec nunc . . . adolescentis*, thus virtually admitting the second charge, with an attempt, however, to show that the admission really involves nothing. In § 29 he passes to the other side of his argument, and from this point on to § 34 he tries to show that it is not true that old age lessens strength, at least to any degree worth considering. (c) A fine example is afforded by the discussion of the third charge, the lack of pleasure, §§ 39-66. Cato begins by saying that if old age takes away pleasure (i.e. sensual pleasure), old age is much to be praised; i.e. 'If your charge is true, what of it?' This covers §§ 39-44. He then goes on to say, 'Your objection, however, is not well taken, for old age has pleasures,—of feasts, of the intellect, of agriculture, of influence' (§§ 44 ff.). Other examples might be cited from Cicero's works.

Coming back now to our passage, we note that in §§ 27-34 Cato has maintained that old age does not really lack strength; i.e. he has been saying, 'Your criticism of old age is mistaken.' The reading *ne sint* makes him go on to say, 'But assuming for the sake of argument that your criticism is well founded, what

of it?' The sharp adversative asyndeton at *ne sint* is then worth noting. *Non sunt*, then, is impossible, whereas *ne sint* is most appropriate. We may therefore adopt the latter reading in defiance of Mss. authority.

In reply to a question by Professor Ashmore, remarks were made by the author.

2. Tacitus, *Annals*, iv. 12, by Professor Edwin W. Fay, of Washington and Lee University.

Igitur contumaciam eius insectari, vetus Augustae odium, recentem Liviae conscientiam exagitare, ut superbam fecunditate, subnixam popularibus studiis inhiare dominationi apud Caesarem arguerent. atque haec callidis criminatoribus, inter quos delegerat Iulium Postumum, per adulterium Mutillae Priscae inter intimos aviae et consilii suis peridoneum, quia Prisca in animo Augustae valida, *anum suapte* natura potentiae *anxiam insociabilem* nurui efficiebat.

Allen's note, in his edition of the *Annals*, points out the difficulties in the interpretation of the second of these sentences, with the various emendations by which scholars have attempted to obviate them.

I propose to emend the italicized words as follows: *anus suapte . . . anxiae insociabilis . . .* The errors on the part of the scribe implied by the corrections proposed are of the most obvious character. Further, I make *haec* the object of *efficiebat*, while its subject is Livia, understood from *arguerent*. This results in the following version of the passage:

"Therefore, by harping on Agrippina's contumacy, Sejanus fanned Augusta's old hatred and Livia's fresh remorse till they charged Agrippina before the emperor, saying, that in pride of her progeny, and in reliance on the favor of the populace, she was plotting a usurpation. And all this (Livia) brought about with the help of crafty slanderers, and chiefly of Julius Postumus, who, owing to his *liaison* with Mutillia Prisca, had access to her (Livia's) grandmother (Augusta), and was therefore well suited to her (Livia's) plans,—forasmuch as Prisca had strong influence with Augusta, who, as was to be expected of an old woman, was naturally anxious-to-retain her power, and had no intention of sharing (*insociabilis*) it with her granddaughter-in-law (Agrippina)."

3. On Lucian, *Timon* 18, by Professor Mortimer Lamson Earle, of Bryn Mawr College.

In his interesting *Notes on Lucian*, PAPA., xvii., xi.-xv., Professor Francis G. Allinson discusses *Timon* 18 in a way that I cannot believe to be sound: I venture, therefore, to offer another interpretation and discussion of that passage and to seek to maintain the integrity of the traditional text where Mr. Allinson believes it to be corrupt.

It seems probable to Professor Allinson that Lucian wrote *κοσκίλου* in this passage, instead of the traditional *κοφίλου*. Before examining his three arguments as such, I may be pardoned for dwelling for a moment on a minor but not altogether unimportant point.

In Plato, *Gorg.* 493 B, it appears highly probable that in the words *ἐτέρῳ*

τοιούτωι τετρημένωι κοσκίνωι the participle τετρημένωι is merely a gloss on τοιούτωι. (See Mr. Adam's note on τῶν τοιούτων καὶ ἀκουσίων in *Apol.* 26 A, and Thompson on *Gorg.* 493 B.) The view that τετρημένωι is a gloss seems to be supported by the next sentence in the *Gorgias*. It may be added that Professor Allinson seems guilty of an inaccuracy when he speaks of a "perforated sieve." τετρημένος (so, too, τετρυπημένος) may mean either "perforated" or "having interstices."

Of Professor Allinson's three arguments I am tempted to say, στέγειν οὐ δύνανται. In the first place, the reference to the jar of the Danaids does not "immediately" follow the clause in which κοφίνου occurs. What immediately follows is a clause involving quite a different figure and standing as a barrier between the κόφινος and the πίθος. We need not, therefore, treat the second and third arguments until we have examined the earlier part of the passage in its relation to what follows.

Wealth, reluctant to revisit Timon, asks Zeus: "Will he (Timon) ever stop bailing me out as fast as he can, as though from a basket with a hole in it, before I have wholly flowed in; wishing to get ahead of the inflow, lest, tumbling in faster than he can bail me out, I overflow him?" This translation fails to do justice to the original in one particular, — that the words ὥσπερ ἐκ κοφίνου τετρυπημένον precede the metaphor. Wealth is naturally first thought of as gold, with which conception a basket is not at all inconsistent. Then wealth is said to flow in, an easy shift of language, — in fact, hardly a shift at all (cf., e.g., *diall. mar.* 12, 1; *Jupp. trag.* 2; *de merc. cond.* 7; and — particularly — *diall. inf.* 11, 4). But the notion of flowing, as specifically applicable to water, is insisted on in ἐπιρροήν. But the figure shifts in the next clause. One need not insist on the fact that in coupling ὑπέραντλος and ἐπιπεσών Lucian is uniting liquid with solid; ἐπικλύσω strictly excludes the image of any small vessel and suggests that we have passed, unwarned, to the bailing of a leaky ship (cf. *navig.* 16). This might be thought decisive against the proposed change of reading, but there is more to follow.

The sentence beginning with ὥστε is to be connected with the preceding by supplying a slight ellipsis. "And so [if I go to him] I expect to carry water to the jar of the Danaids and to bail in to no purpose, because the vessel is not watertight, but what runs in will be poured out almost before it has run in; so much wider [in proportion to the inflow] is the gap in the jar and [so] unhindered the exit [of the water]." In this sentence I would call attention first to the fact that the position of Wealth has shifted. Before, he was the thing that flowed in, was bailed out, tumbled in, threatened to overflow; now he expects to act as water-carrier and bail in like water — what but his unpersonified self, wealth?

Again, we see here even more clearly than before how Lucian becomes the victim of his own metaphor, associated metaphors fading one into the other, and the element of personification tending to still greater confusion.

Again, it seems quite plain that the only part of the traditional imagery of the myth of the Danaids that Lucian has distinctly in mind here is the pouring of water into a broken jar. Nothing is said of the sieve when the jar is spoken of. Indeed, it would be out of place. It is only the leakiness of the receptacle that is in point. Thus Professor Allinson's second argument is answered, and the third is without weight.

The best parallel to the shifting metaphor in this passage—at least, in all Lucian—is in *Timon* 8, which should be carefully compared. In the elevated language of other Greek writers we find the same tendency. Cf. Soph. *O. T.* 22-30, *Ant.* 531-535, *El.* 1290 sq. Another excellent example is to be found in Plato, *Apol.* 30 E-31 (man for horse; gnat(?) for gadfly).

I note in conclusion the modern Greek phrase *ξεπατωμένο καλάθι* = "unorderly Mensch" (Jannaris, *Echo*, p. 25).

4. Note on a Certain Greek Form of Contrasted Clauses in Protasis, by Professor L. H. Elwell, of Amherst College.

Remarks were made by Professors Sihler, Earle, Elwell, and Holmes. An abstract of the paper is withdrawn by the author.

5. The latter part of Lucretius, and Epicurus *περὶ μετεώρων*, by Professor E. G. Sihler, of New York University.

The greater part of Lucretius V. and all of VI. might be summarized in the words of Horace from the *iter Brundisium* 97:

'dein Gnatia lymphis
Iritis extructa dedit risusque iocosque,
Dum flamma sine tura liquescere limine sacro
Persuadere cupit. Credat Iudaeus Apella,
Non ego: namque deos didici securum agere aevum
Nec, siquid miri faciat natura, deos id
Tristes ex allo caeli demittere tecto.'

Thus in the earlier stage of his career; but the pensioner of Maecenas and the court poet who wrote the *carmen saeculare* for the *princeps* could not well make a savage attack on the Etruscan religion or make propaganda for Epicureanism. Nor was the tremendous earnestness of Lucretius any part of Horace's *ingenium*. That earnestness of L. is not inconsistent with reverential humility towards the emancipator of his soul and founder of his sect, I. 66-79, III. 1 sqq., 1042 sqq., V. 8 sq. I am not inclined to consider it psychologically probable that a man like L. would satisfy himself with a mere abstract or compend like the letter to Herodotus, with anything short of the great *fonds doctrinae*, the 37 books of Epicurus *περὶ φύσεως*; particularly when we consider that a mere *dilettante* Epicurean, Calpurnius Piso, had according to Comparetti's computation three copies of the voluminous work in his villa at Herculaneum, the carbonized remnants in the *Museo Nazionale* at Naples being too scanty to permit inferences. The direct and full study of Epicurus' great work also is made more probable by the solid proportion of the element in Lucretius of controversial analysis and censure of other schools, and particularly of the Stoics, although these latter are never mentioned by name (v. George P. Eckman, *The Controversial Elements in Lucretius*, N. Y. Univ. '98), elements not in themselves attractive to the general reader. Hence I do not believe that Ivo Bruns (*Lucretz-studien*, Freiburg, '84) proves his main thesis, viz., that L., in the course of elaborating his theme, determined quietly to omit the theory of cognition, *τὸ κανονικόν*; it was a distinct thing from the doctrine proper *περὶ φύσεως*, and a particular scroll was devoted to it, Diog-

enes L. X. 27 *περὶ κριτηρίου ἢ κανών*. The great aim of L. is *purgare pectora*; *ἀπαρξία* L. VI. 24.

Now L. I.-IV. present substantially what Epicurus called ἡ γνήσιος φυσιολογία. But L. V. and VI. are apt to make the impression of a mass, a congeries, of unrelated or ill-related matter. As for V. the very exordium announces a complex theme: creation of organic beings, persistence of created types, essentially physical nature of mind, deception by visions; my next theme (*rationis ordo*): this organic universe is perishable (Diog. L. 10, 74 *φθαρτοὶ οἱ κόσμοι*); earth, sky, sea, stars, sun, moon, established by association of matter; creation of living beings out of the earth; primitive civilization; origin of speech; absence of conscious purpose in the movement of heavenly bodies; no teleology; no divine providence. These themes are actually found in b. V. though in somewhat different order. Beginning with Lucr. V. 509 sqq. we notice that characteristic mark of Epicurus' *περὶ μετεώρων*, — two or three or more theories to explain *one* phenomenon, a loose eclecticism utterly foreign to the rigid dogmatism of L. I.-IV. A parallel table will best exhibit themes and sequence of themes:

Ep. to Pythocles.

Diog. L. X. 85 sqq.

Sun, moon, and "the other stars."
Size of sun.
Decline and filling of moon.
Face in moon.
Eclipses.
τάξις περιόδου.
Length of night and day.
Clouds.
Rain.
Thunder.
Lightning.
Thunderbolts.
Waterspouts.
Earthquakes.
Winds.
Hail.
Snow.
Dew.
Hoarfrost.
Ice.
Rainbow.
Halo of moon.
Comets.
Slower movement of some stars.
Meteors.

Lucr. V.

509 Motion of stars.
564 Size of sun.
Heat of sun.
614 Sun's mutation of course in the year.
650 Night.
656 Periodicity of sunrise.
680 Correlation of night and day.
705 Moon's phases
751 Eclipses.
(771-779 *Résumé*.)

Book VI.

96 Thunder.
219 Lightning; optical phenomena.
379 Destructive phenomena.
451 Clouds.
495 Rain.
527 Snow, hail, hoarfrost, ice (a few lines only).
535 Earthquakes.
639 Etna.
713 Nile (rise).
738 Exhalation of Avernus.
840 Certain puzzling changes of temperature.
906-1082 Magnet.
1090 Epidemics in general.
1138 The plague at Athens.

The interest of Epicurus is mainly negative: 1) We must eliminate the idea of divine interference; 2) we must reject the postulate of a *single* natural explanation; cf. letter to Herodotus, § 76, letter to Pythocles, §§ 87, 97, 115 (καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ τρόποι εἰς τὸ τοῦτο τελεῖσαι ἀμύθητοί εἰσιν). The knowledge of these concrete phenomena is a mere inferior corollary to atomism proper, to ἡ γνήσιος φυσιολογία (Diog. L. 10, 85). The aim here, too, is not knowledge, but ἀταραξία, and ἀθροῦβως ζῆν § 87, ἀταραξία γνήσιος § 95;—these concrete phenomena, moreover, (§ 86) **πλεοναχὴν** ἔχει καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αἰτίαν καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι σύμφωνον κατηγορίαν. The adhesion to *one* theory is treated with scorn as folly and conceit (§ 94); thus Epicurus gives *four* explanations of the changes of sun and moon (93); of decline and increase of moon, *six*; of clouds, *four* (99); of rain, *four*; of thunder, *five* (100); of lightning, *seven* (101, 102); of earthquakes, *three*, etc., etc.

This unscientific attitude towards problems of science naturally brought the school into sharp contrast, particularly with the Peripatetic and Stoic schools, and marks the characteristic indifference of E. to technical culture *per se*. Usener has collected the passages in his splendid work *Epicurea*, Leipz. 1887, p. 170 sqq. But Usener himself professes to join Philodemus (Herculanean papyri, 2d collation, I. fol. 152) ὑποψ[ι]α ν τιν[α] [λα]μβάν[ει]ν ὡς περὶ τινων ἐπιστολ[ῶν] καὶ τῆς [προς Πυθ]οκλέα π[ρὸς] [με]τεώρων ἐπιτομῆς κτ.έ. But the notice of Philodemus (who was a close contemporary of Lucretius and philosopher in ordinary to Calpurnius Piso) really is in the first place a *prima facie* proof that in his day this summary had a regular place among the writings of Epicurus. The creeping in of a spurious summary is most unlikely in a school in which the *ipse dixit* of the master was zealously guarded. It is entirely possible that Philodemus, a man of wide attainments, had but a slight regard for this weakling among the intellectual progeny of Epicurus and would have been glad to have it cast aside as a bastard. The strongest argument for its genuineness, however, is afforded by the parallel of Lucretius' themes. There, too, one has a feeling that both system and science are cast to the winds. Lucr. V. 620: '*non, inquam, simplex* his rebus reddita causa est.' Cf. 729 sqq., 1151, TI. 702: '*sunt aliquot quoque res quarum unam dicere causam non satis est, verum pluris unde una tamen sit*;' as, e.g., when seeing a corpse lying at a distance (a direct and close inspection on our part being impossible), sword, poison, frost, or disease may have caused his death. And so in these physical phenomena,—positive and exclusive asseverations in this sphere are impossible. Cf. V. 526; of the motion of stars (V. 509 sqq.) *three* conjectural theories; light of moon (575), *two*; periodicity of sun's course (614 sqq.), *two*; night (650), *two*; the correlation of day and night (680 sqq.), *three*; moon's phases (705 sqq.), *three*; eclipses (750 sqq.), *two*; thunder (VI. 96), *nine*; lightning (246), *four*; waterspouts (423), *two*; clouds (451), *five*; rain (495), *four*; earthquakes (535), *four*; rise of Nile (712), *four*; the category of possibility exhausts the resources of the language: Diog. L. 10, 93, ἐνδέχεται . . . ὁμοίως . . . ἢ καὶ . . . ἢ καὶ; 95, καὶ ὁμοίως . . . ἔτι δὲ καὶ . . . ἔτι δὲ ἐνδέχεται, . . . ἐνδέχεται δέ; 95, δύναται καὶ . . . καὶ; 107, ἐνδέχεται . . . γίνοιτο ἂν . . . ἀποτελεσιν ἂν λαμβάνοι . . .; 111, ἦτοι . . . ἦτοι . . . ἦ. Lucr. V. 515 sqq., aut . . . est etiam quoque uti possit; 575 sq., sive . . . sive; 637, fit quoque ut; 651 sq., aut . . . aut quia, also 658, 660, 682, 697; aut etiam quia, 701; potest, 705; est etiam quare, 715; 731 sq., cur nequeat . . .

difficilest ratione docere; 753 sqq., cur luna queat . . . non posse putetur; 762, cur terra queat . . .; 765, aliut nequeat; VI. 121, hoc etiam pacto . . . videntur; 132, est etiam ratio, etc. Seneca (*Nat. Quaest.* VI. 20, 5) with regard to the earthquake of 63 A.D. in referring to Epicurus' theories of earthquakes: 'omnes istas posse esse causas Epicurus ait pluresque alias temptat, et *alios qui aliquid unum* ex his esse adfirmaverunt, *corripit*, cum sit arduum de his quae coniectura sequenda sunt, *aliquid certi* promittere,' and so Seneca's report contains the following words or phrases of conjectural alternative statement: potest . . . potest . . . fortasse enim . . . fortasse . . . fortasse . . . fortasse . . . fortasse. But L. has further themes which hardly come within the sphere of *μετέωρα*: Etna, Nile, exhalation of Arvernus, odd changes of temperature in a certain spring, the magnet, epidemics, the plague of Athens. True; but his fundamental interest is that of *ad Pythoclem* 104, *μόνον ὁ μῦθος ἀπέστω · ἀπέσται δέ, ἐάν τις καλῶς τοῖς φαινόμενοις ἀκολουθῶν περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν σημειῶται*; cf. 113, 116. And so we see L. engaged in elaborate and ambitious efforts to apply the fundamental and abstract doctrines of atomism; e.g. in dealing with Etna, with Avernus, the magnet, 906 sqq., where the preliminary elaboration of first principles is carried on with such fulness that the poet apologizes, 919, 'et nimium longis ambagibus est adeundum,' and 1081, 'nec tibi tam longis opus est ambagibus usquam, nec me tam multam hic operam consumere par est.' And while it is the ambitious attempt to apply first principles (cf. Diog. L. 10, 116, *τὴν τῶν ἀρχῶν καὶ ἀπειρίας καὶ τῶν συγγενῶν τούτοις θεωρίαν*) to definite physical problems which swelled the theme of the *magnet* to the bulky total of 184 lines, the theme of *thunder and lightning* in VI. 96-379 covers only a little less than 300 lines, and then follows the fervid attack on the formulae of the Etruscan ritual and the folly of ascribing these manifestations to Jupiter, which uprooting of the popular fear of the gods and of its interdependence with the fear of death is really the chief motive and the very essence of this unique poem. The practical and moral interest of emancipating the soul vastly predominates over the didactic and speculative interest.

But the limits of the *liber*, the mechanical necessity, too, of limitation (so instructively elaborated by Th. Birt, *Das Antike Buchwesen*, 1882), put their constraint upon the poet; so that, side by side with this disproportionate elaboration of particular themes as just noted, we find, e.g. VI. 527 sqq., snow, winds, hail, hoarfrost, ice, merely summarily mentioned and turned over to the reader's application of first principles. We must not, however, incline to the assumption that this apparent miscellany of physical and meteorological themes and problems in L. V.-VI. was a mere appendix, or second-thought supplement, of the work proper; for in the very first detailed announcement of his chief themes, in I. 27, this entire matter is even placed first in order:

'qua propter bene cum *superis de rebus* habenda
nobis est ratio, solis lunaeque meatus
qua fiant ratione. . . '

In conclusion we ask: Were the *μετέωρα* an essential part of the 37 bb. *περί φύσεως*? It seems impossible to prove that the letter to Herodotus, § 35-83, is a true — i.e. an even and truly proportioned — summary of the entire range of the great work of 37 bb.; the brief reference to *μετέωρα*, § 76, is too slender for elab-

orate or positive inferences. In the list of Epicurus' works, Diog. L. X. 27 sqq., some 49 titles with 89 volumina are recorded as τὰ βέλτιστα out of the total of 300 κύλινδροι. With the exception of περὶ νότων δόξαι, there is no title specifically bearing upon the subject of μετέωρα.

6. Punning Allusion to Euripides in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, v. 666, by Dr. George Dwight Kellogg, of Yale University.

665 δεῦρο Μοῦσ' ἔλθ' ἐπ' ἀνέμῳ πυρὸς ἔχουσα μένος ἔντονος Ἀχαρνική.
ὅσον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πρηνῶν φέψαλος ἀνήλατ' ἐρεθιζόμενος οὐρίᾳ ῥιπίδι.

The object of this paper is briefly to show that the odd phrase, ἐρεθιζόμενος οὐρίᾳ ῥιπίδι, in v. 666, "fired up by the breezy blower," may be understood as "fired up by Eu-ripides." This theory gains strong support from the fact that verses 659-664 immediately preceding and constituting the πνίγος of this παράβασις are a parody on a familiar quotation from a lost play of Euripides, attested by Suidas v. ἀλωτόν and παλαμᾶσθαι, and quoted by Cicero, *ad Attic.* VIII. 8. 2; VI. 1. 8; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VI. p. 797; M. Anton. VII. 42. Bergk suggests that this quotation may be from the *Telephus* which Aristophanes hits so hard in this comedy.

1. Phonetically considered, the word-play is possible. *eu* and *ou* sometimes approach, as in Ionic contract verbs. The effect is heightened by the ictus, which falls on the first syllables of οὐρίᾳ ῥιπίδι. The discrepancy in the number of syllables, universally admissible, may be paralleled by *Acharn.* 215:

ἡκολούθουν Φαῦλλῳ τρέχων, ὦδε φαύλως ἂν ὁ
σπονδοφόρος οὗτος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ τότε διωκόμενος.

2. In the first part of the *Acharnians*, Euripides figures prominently both as *dramatis persona* and as object of comic raillery in the dialogue. His name occurs seven times, occupying the last two feet of the verse (vv. 394, 395, 400, 414, 452, 467, 485). In 404 the name fills a verse *extra metrum*. In 410 and 437 it occupies the first two feet; in 462, the third and fourth. The diminutive Εὐριπίδιον also fills the first two feet of 475. The prominence given to the name at the close of the verse suggests another argument, — *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.

3. οὐρίος is a favorite Euripidean word (*Iph. A.* 352, 1596; *Her.* 822; *Herc. Fur.* 95; *Hec.* 900; *Hel.* 147, 406, 1588, 1612, 1663), generally of a favoring breeze, voyage, flight. The *Helena*, in which the word recurs so often, was brought out thirteen years after the *Acharnians*.

4. The word ῥιπίς, "bellows," is in the nature of the case rare. But it occurs once again in our play (v. 888) in an interesting context:

δμῶες ἐξενέγκατε
τὴν ἐσχάραν μοι δεῦρο καὶ τὴν ῥιπίδα.

Without trying to prove another punning allusion in δεῦρο . . . τὴν ῥιπίδα, v. 888, we may, however, note that δμῶες, so frequent in Euripides but not in comedy, suggests tragic parody, and that almost in the same breath, in vv. 893-895, we have a shocking travesty of *Alcestis*, v. 367: "Not even in death would I be sep-

arated from thee garnished with beet-root!" alluding unmistakably to the standing joke about Euripides' mother.

5. The only Euripidean lines which I can cite which parallel *Acharn.* 665, 666, are from the *Bacchae*, vv. 145-150, a play of much later date than the *Acharnians*.

ὁ Βακχεὺς δ' ἔχων
 πυρσῶδῃ φλόγα πεύκας
 ἐν νάρθηκος ἀίσσει
 δρόμῳ καὶ χοροῖς ἐρεθίζων πλανάτας
 λαχαῖς τ' ἀναπάλλων,
 τρυφερὸν πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων.

It is possible that the original of *Acharn.* 665, 666, was a dithyrambic invocation used by Euripides on several occasions.

6. Of the twenty or more parodies on Euripides which occur before line 430, all but about five seem to be from the lost *Telephus*. Hence there is a probability that Bergk's attribution of the πνῆγος to the *Telephus* is correct; hence lines 665, 666, may also be from the *Telephus*.

While on this subject I should like to call attention to another jingle on the name of Euripides in v. 437. There Dicaeopolis replies to Euripides in a speech which is a veritable mosaic of quotations from that author.

Εὐριπίδῃ, 'πειδὴ περ ἐχαρίσω ταδί.

The echo 'πειδὴ-περ would seem intentional.

7. Greek Words in Plautus, by Dr. Herbert Müller Hopkins, of the University of California.

1. L. Mueller (*De Re Metrica*, p. 487) calls attention to the fact that Greek words show a Latin form in the early Latin authors, till a new fashion of reproducing them in their exact Greek form was introduced by Accius. This fashion culminated in the introduction into the Latin alphabet of *y*, *z*, *ch*, *ph*, *th*. Plautus, as is natural, shows the same tendency as the other predecessors of Accius. For example, we should not look for the termination *a* in the acc. sing., or *as* in the acc. plur., 3d Decl., in a loan-word from the Greek.

Quintilian (1. 5. 61) says that most early writers wrote *Aenea*, *Anchisa*, representing the Greek *as* or *ης* of the 1st Decl. by *ā*. So in Plautus, e.g. Epid. 626, *Apella*. The examples of *as* in the nom. sing. are very few, viz. Merc. 945, *Calchas*; but in Men. 748, abl. *Calcha*, not *Calchante*. In Poen. 955, 1058, *Antidamas*, but *Antidamae* in gen. in Poen. 1042, 1047; Poen. 1045, *Antidamati*; Trin. 916, *Callias*.

In the voc. sing. Plautus uses the Greek form; e.g. Asin. 740, *Leonidā*. We find *ā* in the nom. to represent the Greek *as* or *ης* in the following cases.

Amph. 438:

Quis ego sum saltēm, si non sum Sōsiā? te interrogo.

Ibid. 439:

Ubi ego Sōsiā nolim ēsse tu ēsto sane Sōsia.

Asin. 762:

Ne epistulā quidem ulla sit in aēdibus.

Here we have three examples of *ā* in the nom. of Greek words, though of course the *ā* was the usual ending.

In *epistulā* (Asin. 762) we have *ā* representing the Greek *η* in the nom. Mr. W. M. Lindsay suggests the reading *nulla* for *ulla* in the line, which is consistent with Plautine usage and shortens the *a* in *epistula*. I hardly think that Plautus used the long *a* in *epistula* because of the *η* in the Greek word. It seems more reasonable to suppose that such a frequently used word had ceased to be regarded as Greek, just as we adopt French words like *depôt*. Perhaps the long *a* is a reminiscence of the original long *a* in the nom. in Latin words. An example of long *a* in the nom. of a Latin word is found in Plautus, Epid. 498:

Potuit: plus iam sum liberā quinquēnnium.

Here Mr. Lindsay suggests the adv. *liberē* for the adj. *liberā*, a conjecture justified by Plautine usage.

To sum up: We find long *a* in Plautus in the nom. and voc. of Greek words at least four times, and once at least in a Latin word, unless we are to destroy our examples by emendation. I am inclined to regard these few examples as traces of an original long *a* in old Latin.

2. A Greek neuter noun of the 3d Decl. is put in the 1st Decl. by Plautus, and declined like a Latin noun. In Amph. 117 we find *cum servili schema*. We find the same phenomenon in Caecilius (Prisc. Gr. L. K. Vol. 2, p. 200); but *schema-sin*, dat. and abl. plur., is found in Varro, as we might expect (Charis. Gr. L. K. Vol. 1, p. 53). So too Lucilius, frag. 604, Baehrens, Poet. Lat. Min. Vol. VI., has *schema antiquom*.

Another example of a Greek neut. noun of the 3d Decl. found in the 1st Decl. in Plaut. is *glaucumam*, Mil. 148.

3. Other words transferred from the 3d Decl. Greek to the 1st Decl. Latin are: *lanterna*, Amph. 149, 406; *poematis*, Asin. 174; *Bellerophantam*, Bacch. 810, defended by Ritschl in Opus. Philol. Vol. 4, pp. 295, 296, as over against the 3d Decl. form *Bellerophontem*, which Goetz and Schoell read. The Mss. give *Bellerophontem iam*. The *iam* is explained by Ritschl as having been written *tam* originally, above the syllable *tem*, as a correction to the 3d Decl. form, thus:

Bellerophontem^{tam}. Most editors delete the *iam*, metri gratia, without explaining its presence in the Mss., and read the 3d Decl. form. Cf. *Aristophontes*, Capt. 527, etc.

In Cas. 493 we have *lopadas*; also in Rud. 297 and fab. frag. cert. 104 (G. and S.). Possibly in this class we may include *lampadam*, Cas. 840. The Mss. give *lampadēm*, however, and even the Ms. testimony for *lampadam* in Prisc. (Gr. L. K. Vol. 2, p. 330) is conflicting. We find *lampade* in the abl., Cas. 796, and *lampadibus* in Men. 842, with one dissenting reading, *lampadis*. The case for *lampada*, therefore, is not made out with any degree of certainty. In Curc. 443, *Paphilagonas*, acc. plur., is found, representing a 3d Decl. Greek word.

4. A form that is *sui generis* in Plautus, to the best of my knowledge, is *Homeronidam*, Truc. 485.

5. Greek nouns of the 1st Decl. ending in *ἰδης, ἰδου*, may show a genitive in Plautus in *idi*; e.g. *Euripidi*, Rud. 86. This probably came about through analogy with *δῶμου, domi, δόλου, doli*, and might be expressed by the formula, *δῶμου: domi :: ἰδου: idi*.

As the Romans used *i* for **ov** in the 2d Decl., they supposed that *i* could represent also the **ov** of the 1st Decl. in the gen. In Pseud. 757 we find *Aeschinum*, which is perhaps due to a gen. sing. in *i*. Cf. Ter. Ad. 26, *Aeschinus*. Other examples are: Mil. 870, *Periplecomenus*; ibid. 969, *Periplecomeni*; Trin. 359, *Charmidi*, cod. A, where G. and S. read *Charmidai*, metri gratia; ibid. 744, *Charmidi*. In other cases we find the 3d Decl. form; e.g. Trin. 106, *Charmides*; ibid. 950, *Charmidem*; ibid. 964, *Charmide*.

An extension of this use of *i* in the gen. to represent the Greek **ov** of the 2d and 1st Decl. is its use to represent the **ov** or **ovs** in the gen. of the Greek 3d Decl. For, as words in **ης**, 1st Decl., have a gen. in **ov**, so even the Greeks, at least bet. 350 and 300 B.C., supposed that words of the 3d Decl. could have a gen. in **ov**. Thus we have in C. I. A. II. 573, 11, **Ἀριστοκράτου**; ibid. II. 809 c, 52, **Δημοσθένου**. This explains the genitives in *i* of 3d Decl. Greek words in Plautus. Exempli gratia, Bacch. 938, *Achilli*, gen., the other cases being in the 3d Decl., as in Mil. 61, *Achilles*; Merc. 488, *Achillem*. In Capt. 975, *Philocrati*, gen.; 3d Decl. forms in other cases. Epid. 29, *Stratippocli*; ibid. 34, *Stratippocles*. Epid. 36, Trin. 820, *Nerei*. Epid. 179, Most. 984, Persa 2, Rud. 822, *Herculi*. In other cases *Hercules* is declined according to the 3d Decl.; e.g. in Bacch. 155, Stich. 223, 386, Rud. 161, Stich. 233, Bacch. 665, Rud. 490. In Epid. 246, 508, 635, *Periphani*, where G. and S. read *Periphanaei* for the sake of the meter.

6. Other Greek nouns transferred from the 3d Greek Decl. to the 2d Latin are: Amph. 45, *architectus*; Mil. 902, *architecte*; ibid. 919, *architecti*, nom. plur.; Truc. 3, *architectis*, abl. plur.; but in Most. 760 and Poen. 1110 we find *architectonem*; Aul. 198, *polypos*, acc. plur.; Bacch. 235, *Piraeum*; Capt. 378, *Tyndare*; ibid. 990, *Tyndarus*; Curc. 424, *elephantum*; Mil. 25, 235, *elephanto*; ibid. 30, *elephanti*, gen.; Men. 144, *Adoneum*; Merc. 469, Vid. 94, *Pentheum*; Poen. 443, *Oedipo*; Rud. 509, *Tereo*.

In Pseud. 665 we find a voc. *Harpage*, but the nom. *Harpax*, ibid. 653, 654. There is no nom. *Harpagus* or *Harpages* in Plautus. Cf. Trin. 617, *Charmide*, voc., *libri*; Most. 1130, *Calidamate*, voc., *libri*, but in Most. 341, 372, *Callidamates*, voc., which form ought to be restored in Most. 1130. In Trin. 617, also, we must read *Charmides* with G. and S. for *Charmide* of the Mss. This latter reading is like the blunder found so often in the Mss. of Terence, *Chreme*, voc., for *Chremes*. Here I might mention the form *Tranium*, Most. 560, a 2d Decl. acc. of *Tranio*, *onis*.

7. Greek nouns in **ων**, **ωνος**, and **ων, ωντος**, are both declined in Plautus in *o, onis*, with the following few exceptions: *Palaemon*, Rud. 160; *Alazon*, Mil. 86; *Acheruns*, *untis*, etc., saepe. This last word was probably corrupted by frequent usage.

The following are declined in *o, onis*, whether they represent **ων**, **ωνος**, or **ων, ωντος**: *Creo*, *Parmeno*, *Demipho*, *Callipho*, *Antipho*, *Amphitruo*, *Blepharo*, *Euclyio*, *Apollo*, *Dromo*, *Machaerio*, *Artamo*, *Agamemno*, *Hegio*, *Olympio*, *Lampadio*, *Lycio*, *Thesprio*, *Messenio*, *Liparo*, *Hiero*, *Acanthio*, *Palaestrio*, *Cario*, *Tranio* (with one acc. *Tranium*), *Sagaristio*, *Milphio*, *alcedo*, *Ballio*, *Simo*, *Sceparnio*, *Trachalio*, *Turbalio*, *Philemo*, *Phillo*, *Acharistio*, *Artemo*, *Cephalio*.

8. The casual manner in which Plautus used Greek words is illustrated by the heteroclite declensions. I have already mentioned *Harpax*, *Harpage*; *Tranio*,

Tranium; *architectus*, *architectonem*; *Achilles*, *Achilli*; *Hercules*, *Herculi*, etc. In Merc. 945 we find *Calchas*, but *Calcha* in the abl., Men. 748. The only complete example is *Philolaches*:

- NOM. *Philolaches* (Most. 182, 626, 910).
 GEN. *Philolachae* [? *Philolochis*] (ibid. 374).
 DAT. *Philolachi* (ibid. 1082).
 ACC. *Philolachem* (ibid. 284, 964, 974^b).
 ABL. *Philolache* (ibid. 245), *Philolacho*, Varro, L. L. IX, 54.
 GEN. *Philolachetis* (ibid. 560).
 DAT. *Philolacheti* (ibid. 797).
 DAT. *Philolacheti*, *libri*, *Philolachi*, G. and S. (ibid. 167).
 ACC. *Philolachetem* (ibid. 349, 616).
 ABL. *Philolachete* (ibid. 1011).

9. From the Greek puns of Plautus I shall select five for remark.

(a) Bacch. 240:

Haud dōrmitandumst: ὄpus est chryso Chrýsalo.

"Gould must have gold."

(b) Pseud. 585^a:

Bállionem exbállistabo lépide: date operám modo.

"I'll bounce Mr. Bouncer." It seems from this pun that the popular derivation of *Ballio* was from βállω, whereas it is really derived from φállός, of course. Cf. *ballaena*, φállαινα.

The next three puns illustrate the Roman pronunciation of the Greek diphthongs θ, φ, χ. These were represented in loan-words by *t*, *p* or *b*, and *c*, until about the time of Cicero.

(a) Plautus puns on *Chrysalus* (pronounced *Crusalus*) and *crucisálus* (from *crux* and *salio*), Bacch. 362:

Faciétque extemplo Crúcisalum me ex Chrýsalo.

(b) In Pseud. 736 he puns on *Charinus* (pronounced *Carinus*) and *careo*, illustrating the same point:

Di immortales, nōn Charimus mihi hicquidem, sed Cōpiast.

(c) In Capt. 274 he puns on *Thalem* (pronounced *Talem*) and *talentum*.

Eúgepae, Thalém talento nōn emam Milésium.

"I wouldn't give a *thaler* (pronounced *taler*) for *Tales*."

So often in the Mss. we find the misspelling *t* for *th*, where the scribe wrote as he would pronounce, or more likely copied the error handed down from early Mss. Thus, in Men. 303, codd. B, C, and D give *ciatisso* for the correct *ciathisso*.

The diphthong φ was represented by *p* in *paenula* (φαινόλης), *spinter* (σφιγκτήρ), etc.; but we find *b* for φ in *ballaena* (φállαινα) and in the pun on *Ballio* (φállός) mentioned above.

The result of this investigation is to show the casual and unscientific way in which Plautus used Greek nouns, and to disclose some facts of Roman pronunciation of Greek diphthongs.

Remarks were made by Professor Sihler.

8. Disguising on the Stage as a Dramatic Device in Sanskrit Plays,
by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia University.

Disguising on the stage by assuming another's dress, manner, rôle, or appearance, for the sake of concealing identity or for passing incognito by impersonating another, in order to bring about some desired end, is a familiar dramatic device on the English stage. Rosalind, Portia, the Duke in the *Measure for Measure*, and a score of similar instances, are known to every one. It is interesting to find the same artifice employed at an early date in Sanskrit plays; and the romantic character of the Hindu drama naturally led to a not uncommon use of the contrivance in the further development of the stage. The purpose of the communication, of which the present sketch is an abstract, was to bring forward and discuss in chronological order such instances of this device as the writer had noticed in reading the dramatic literature of India. The results may be briefly summarized.

It was first pointed out that the canons of Hindu dramaturgy recognize the device as a histrionic element. See *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* 6. 507, which gives a rule that applies not merely to a youth or man playing a woman's part, but equally to a man who is performing a male rôle in the play, and then assumes female disguise, for the moment, in order to develop a certain point in the action, just as in Ben Jonson's *Epicæne, or the Silent Woman*.

The extant plays of the first two Hindu dramatists, S'ūdraka and Kālidāsa, as the paper showed, do not contain any regular instance of disguising as a dramatic expedient. The case of Urvas'ī's remaining invisible because of wearing the magic veil is not to be regarded as falling under this particular category (see *Vikramorvas'īya*, ii. pp. 41-49, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition).

Second, the earliest instances that were noted were found in the three plays of S'rī-Harsha Deva (first half of seventh century A.D.). The dramatic works which bear the name of this king as author, may be lacking in invention, but they show originality in the clever employment of the contrivance under discussion, or in the skilful way in which disguising is used for dramatic purposes. An examination was made of the *Ratnāvalī* (act iii. p. 41-53, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition; or Böhrlingk, *Sanskrit Chrestomathie*, p. 309, 2te Aufl.); then of the clever play-scene in the *Priyadars'ikā* (act iii. pp. 24-43, ed. Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara; cf. also French translation by Strehly, pp. 41-64); and finally, of the humorous buffoon episode in the *Nāgānanda* (act iii. pp. 37-38, ed. S. G. Bhānap; cf. also French translation by Bergaigne, p. 59), and of the striking scene in the last act of the play where the hero Jīmūtavāhana assumes the red robe which disguises him as the fated victim of the ravenous bird Garuḍa (act iv. p. 66; cf. Bergaigne, p. 101).

Third, attention was called, with some detail, to the introduction of the artifice of disguise in two of the plays of Bhavabhūti (A.D. eighth century). The typical example, which is chosen also by the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* as an illustration of a youth disguising himself as a girl, is found in the *Mālātī-mādhava*, or Sanskrit Romeo and Juliet. Here the youth Makaranda masquerades for a time as Mālātī, and the deception is eminently successful (act vi. pp. 104-7, Calcutta edition, 1830; cf. Wilson, *Theatre of the Hindus*, ii. 74-76; Lévi, *Théâtre Indien*, p. 215). Incidentally, Bhavabhūti furnishes another example in the fourth act of his *Mahā-*

vīra-carita, in which the ogress S'ūrpanakhā assumes the guise of the deceitful and treacherous Mantharā. The stage direction here reads *tataḥ pravīṣ'ati lakṣmaṇaḥ mantharāveśā s'ūrpanakhā ca* (act iv. 66, p. 154, ed. Anundoram Borooh; cf. Pickford's transl. p. 82). Compare also later in the text *mantharā-rūpa-dhāriṇyā s'ūrpanakhayā . . . etad vihitam* (act vii. 75, p. 292, ed. Borooh; cf. Pickford, p. 168).

In the century following Bhavabhūti, the dramatist Vis'ākha-datta (A.D. ninth century) was shown to afford one of the best illustrations of the use that may be made of disguise as a histrionic device. His well-known play *Mudrā-rākshasa* (ed. K. T. Telang, Bombay Sanskrit Series, 27) is a political drama that recalls Richelieu; and its Machiavelian stratagems give ample opportunity for instances of concealment of identity. These were commented upon at some length; a reference here to Lévi, *Théâtre Indien*, p. 227, will suffice.

The last illustration noticed was from Rājas'ekhara (between the eighth and tenth centuries A.D.). Two examples occur in his *Viddha-s'ālabhañjikā*. In this comedy a princess passes incognito as a page at the king's court (act i. seq., ed. B. R. Arte; cf. Wilson, ii. 354; Lévi, p. 245); and a slave boy is palmed off as a girl to play a trick (act ii. p. 47, ed. Arte), somewhat as in the *Mālātī-mādhava* or in Ben Jonson's *Silent Woman*. The situations were described, and the study concluded with an estimate of the value of disguising as a dramatic device in the Hindu plays.

9. The Admetus of Euripides viewed in Relation to the Admetus of Tradition, by Professor Hermann L. Ebeling, of Miami University.

This paper is printed in full in the TRANSACTIONS. Remarks upon it were made by Dr. Huddilston.

An invitation was then extended to the Association by President and Mrs. Smith to attend a reception at their house on Wednesday afternoon.

Adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association, together with a large number of guests, assembled at eight o'clock in Alumni Hall, to listen to the address of the President, Professor Minton Warren, of Johns Hopkins University. The speaker was introduced by President George Williamson Smith, who extended a welcome to the Association on behalf of the Corporation of Trinity College.

10. The Archaeological Giro and the Philological Seminar, by Professor Minton Warren, of Johns Hopkins University, President of the Association.

Replying first to the cordial welcome extended by President Smith, of Trinity College, to the Association, the President then referred to the severe loss which the Association had sustained since its last meeting in the death of Dr. J. Ham-

mond Trumbull, of Hartford, its first Treasurer and one of its early Presidents, and in the death of Professor Frederic D. Allen, of Harvard University, President of the Association for the year 1881-82, and one of its most prominent members.

The subject was then announced to be "The Archaeological Giro and the Philological Seminar."

From the time when the anonymous author of the *Itinerary of Einsiedeln* went to Rome and set down so many of the buildings and inscriptions which he saw in the Eternal City, innumerable have been the pilgrims who have wended their way to Italy to enjoy its art, to study its antiquities, and to drink in the inspiration of its historic past. Many a classical student has here vivified his knowledge, and renewed his vows to scholarship. Ritschl used to say that in Italy the whole man was made over, and whenever possible he sent the most brilliant of his pupils to Italy to quicken them as he had been quickened. Of late years the Germans and Austrians have realized the importance of urging the teachers in their gymnasia to visit Italy, and of making provision for their examining its monuments under expert guidance. This is the function of the 'Giro,' or 'Anschauungscursus.' A good description of such a Giro, in which seventeen teachers from various parts of Germany participated in 1893, is given by Dr. Glässer in the 150th volume of Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*. The places visited were Florence, Orvieto, Rome, Pompeii, Naples, and Pestum, and the guides who communicated the necessary information were Professors Petersen, Hülsen, and Mau, all connected with the German Archaeological Institute in Rome. Reference was also made to other Giri, some even more extensive, conducted under different auspices. The Germans expect not only that the teacher will carry back from such a Giro thousands of beautiful impressions and interesting experiences, a deeper appreciation of art, and the incentive to further study, but that he will make a practical use of his widened knowledge and experience to impart to his instruction new charm, more variety, and more life. If the highest aim of the modern classical teacher is to make his pupils enjoy the masterpieces of Greek and Roman literature as they enjoy Shakespeare and Thackeray, he must reproduce for them as far as possible the atmosphere of ancient life, and strive to make as real as possible the outward conditions and environment of the ancient writers themselves and of the characters who live in their works. The teacher who has felt in his heart the pang of separation from Rome can understand far better the bitterness of Ovid's spirit as he wrote his *Tristia* at Tomi.

The privileges of such Giri have been enjoyed by the regular students of the American Schools at Athens and Rome, and the School in Rome contemplates establishing a summer course of this sort, to include at least Naples, Pompeii, and Rome, for the benefit of teachers who can only visit Italy during the summer months.

Turning to the Philological Seminar, its rapid extension was first noted. Whereas twenty-five years ago it was almost unknown in this country, now there is hardly a prominent institution which does not announce in its catalogue one or more seminaries of this character. Quotations were also given from the catalogues of smaller and less prominent colleges, showing that there is a tendency to establish seminaries where the necessary equipment is wanting. For the sake of setting forth more clearly the proper aim and sphere of the seminary, a brief sketch was given of the German Seminar and its development under such scholars

as Gesner, Wolf, Hermann, Boeckh, Lehrs, and Ritschl, and its importance in the training of teachers was emphasized. The seminary gives mastery, method, and independence of judgment. It is the soul of the university, the "seed-plot of the enthusiasm of learning." It teaches one to prove every opinion, to submit to no authority as such. A Greifswald professor, Ernst Bernheim, has recently published a brochure (*Der Universitätsunterricht und die Erfordernisse der Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1898) advocating the curtailment of lectures and the inclusion of a greater proportion of the students in the practical exercises of the Seminar.

Recognizing, then, the importance of the seminary as an efficient instrument in the work of the American university, some of the difficulties in the way of copying the German Seminar in all its details were pointed out, while the necessity of thoroughly carrying out its spirit and aim was insisted upon. With Gabriel Compayré, the attempt to have graduate instruction where there are neither adequate libraries, adequate teachers, nor a sufficient number of students, was characterized as a wasteful expenditure of force, and the following passage from the same French critic, referring to the mixing of graduate and undergraduate work, was quoted with approval:

"Qui ne voit les inconvénients graves de cette cohabitation de deux ordres d'enseignement, profondément distincts par leur caractère et leur destination? N'est-il pas à craindre que les intérêts de l'un ou de l'autre ne soient sacrifiés, que l'enseignement secondaire ne devienne trop spécial, trop technique, qu'il ne perde le caractère, qui est le sien, d'être une culture générale de l'esprit; que des professeurs qui enseignent à la fois à l'Université et au collège (au moins en ce qui concerne les lettres et les sciences) ou bien n'apportent dans l'enseignement secondaire des exigences, des habitudes d'érudition et de recherche savante qui ne lui conviennent pas; ou inversement, qu'ils ne maintiennent jusque dans leurs chaires de haute instruction les méthodes trop élémentaires de l'enseignement des collèges; que par conséquent, l'enseignement supérieur n'en soit abaissée et amoindri, la coupure n'étant point faite et les limites restant indélicées?"

Despite the danger hinted at by Compayré, the outlook on the whole for graduate instruction and the development of the seminary in our universities was recognized as most hopeful. We must have the courage, however, to recognize our own shortcomings, and in the structure of our higher education, which has been too hastily reared to be solid at every point, we must strive gradually to strengthen the weak places.

MORNING SESSION.

HARTFORD, July 6, 1898.

The Association assembled at 9.40 A.M.

II. On the Nature and Scope of Aristotle's Homeric Criticism, by Dr. Mitchell Carroll, of Johns Hopkins University.

In his Hopkins thesis entitled *Aristotle's Poetics c. xxv. in the Light of the Homeric Scholia*, of which an epitome appeared in the PROCEEDINGS OF SPECIAL SESSION, 1894, pp. xxii-xxiv, the writer showed that we have in the Homeric scholia abundant commentary illustrative of the chapter in question, traceable

directly to the 'Απορήματα 'Ομηρικὰ of Aristotle and his followers. Further studies in the pre-Alexandrine criticism and interpretation of Homer make it evident to him that there exist in the *Poetics*, the Homeric scholia, and elsewhere, fragments and illustrations of Aristotelian teachings sufficient to justify us in ascribing to Aristotle the careful formulation of methods of criticism of the Homeric poems, textual, linguistic, literary, and aesthetic.

It is the aim of the complete study to give a systematic and exhaustive treatment of Aristotle's utterances and opinions concerning Homer gathered from every source, to systematize his observations, to weigh his methods of interpretation, and to make a general estimate of the value of his contributions to Homeric criticism.

The scope of such an inquiry is naturally a broad one, and the following remarks purport to be merely a skeleton outline of certain topics treated at length in the complete paper, as they are suggested by a study of the *Poetics*.

In my former study I showed that the 'Απορήματα 'Ομηρικὰ of Aristotle and the Peripatetics form a considerable part of the Porphyrian *ζητήματα* of the scholia; that far more remains of this work than is usually published in the Aristotelian Corpus; and that their value is much greater than is usually conceded, since they contain methods of explanation growing out of Aristotle's theory of poetry and throw light on many a dark problem of the *Poetics*. Hence the present estimate has the advantage of all that have preceded it, in having larger material to draw from and in being based on a more thorough and systematic study of all the material.

What, then, are our sources of information regarding Aristotle's Homeric studies?

1. The *Poetics*, containing a discussion of tragic and epic poetry, with many allusions to Homer.

2. The 'Απορήματα 'Ομηρικὰ of Aristotle and the Peripatetics, as preserved in the Homeric scholia, discussing, according to my collectanea, more than one hundred and fifty passages in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

3. References to Homer and citations from Homer in Aristotle's other works.

4. External evidence of Aristotle's Homeric activity in Isok., Dio Chrys., Diog. Laert., Plutarch, and elsewhere.

Aristotle was probably driven to the study of the nature of poetry by the caviling criticism of philosophers and sophists, and especially by the well-meaning but pedantic polemic of his great teacher, Plato. Up to this time utility and instruction were regarded as the end of poetry, and this conception naturally led to much fault-finding with the poets, and especially with Homer. Led on by a profound admiration of Homer, Aristotle, in seeking to meet these objections, made a study of the nature of poetry, — its end (which he found to be pleasure), its several species and the parts of each, the causes of poetic beauties and poetic faults, the censures of critics and the principles on which they are to be answered.

It is a noticeable fact, that though the *Poetics* is devoted most largely to tragedy, yet Homer is cited far more frequently than any other poet, and in a way that shows him to be the object of the author's chief study and his poems the ideal works from which Aristotle derived his principles. The following remarks indicate the truthfulness of this statement:

1. *Homer in the discussion of poetic imitation.*

In his treatment of the means, the objects, and the manner of poetic imitation, Aristotle cites Homer in illustration of his teachings regarding each. Thus in discussing the means, he shows that poetry is not a matter of metre, and to prove his point contrasts Homer with Empedokles, the former being essentially a poet, the latter a physicist; under manner he states that Homer is a poet who in narration takes another's personality; regarding the objects of imitation, Homer and Sophokles are cited as imitators of ideal character (1448 a 26, 27).

2. *Homer in the treatment of the rise of tragedy and comedy.*

Aristotle finds in Homer the first poetry of the satirical kind, who in his *Margites* sketched out the main lines of comedy by dramatizing the ludicrous, while being at the same time preëminent among poets in the serious style. Thus, "The *Margites*," says he, "has the same relation to comedy as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to tragedy" (1448 b 34-40).

3. *Homer in the points of likeness between epos and tragedy.*

Aristotle in a number of passages emphasizes the similarities between epos and tragedy, and concludes that one who knows the beauties and defects of tragedy is also a judge of the beauties and defects of epic poetry (1449 b 16-20). These points of likeness are as follows: (a) Both imitate characters of ideal grandeur, as in the poetry of Homer and Sophokles; (b) epos has the same constituent parts as tragedy, excepting song and scenery,—viz. plot, character, sentiments, and diction; (c) it requires, like tragedy, reversals of fortune, recognitions, and tragic incidents; (d) it must, like tragedy, be simple, complicated, 'ethical,' or 'pathetic,' the *Iliad* being at once simple and 'pathetic,' the *Odyssey* complicated and 'ethical.'

"In all these respects," says Aristotle, "Homer is our earliest and sufficient model" (1459 b 8-13).

Aristotle discusses in cc. vi-xxii the constituent parts of tragedy, one by one; and later, in treating epic poetry (cc. xxiii-xxiv), merely sums up his observations about tragedy, and applies them, where appropriate, to epos.

A. Thus unity of plot is demanded in both; i.e. the law of necessity or probability, so frequently emphasized, must be strictly observed. In respect to *plot*, as in all else, he finds Homer, whether from art or genius, to be of surpassing merit (1451 a 23), and cites both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as examples of artistic unity. Thus, in composing the *Odyssey* he did not bring in all the adventures of Odysseus, between which there was no necessary or probable connection, but made it to centre around one, complete action (1451 a 23-30). Likewise in the *Iliad* he did not make the whole Trojan war the subject of his poem, which would have been too cumbrous a theme; but he selects a single portion, and merely diversifies the poem by admitting many episodes from the general story of the war (1459 a 30-38).

B. All that is said of *character* in c. xv he applies to epos as well, and commends Homer for introducing personages not "wanting in characteristic qualities, but each with a character of his own" (1460 a 9-11).

C. As regards the *sentiments*, defined as "the faculty of saying what is possible or pertinent in given circumstances," they must be artistically expressed, and Aristotle finds in Homer an unrivalled example of the proper manner of treatment (1459 b 16-17).

D. So, too, the *diction* must be artistic, and in this respect also he considers Homer unequalled (1459 b 16-17).

4. *Homer in the treatment of the objections to poetry and the principles on which they are to be answered.*

As the censures of critics had in large measure led Aristotle to the study of poetry, it is natural that near the close of his work he should take up these objections and show how they are to be removed by a consideration of the poetic principles already discussed. This is the nature and the object of c. xxv, on which the Homeric scholia have thrown so much light. It is worthy of note that of the many citations in that chapter all except two are taken from Homer. It is to be expected that the objections would be censures of either plot, character, sentiments, or diction, and my collectanea from the scholia show this to be the case. For a complete analysis of the chapter with citations from the scholia, see my thesis, *Aristotle's Poetics c. xxv in the Light of the Homeric Scholia*. I shall here merely attempt to suggest the linguistic and aesthetic nature of Aristotle's methods of criticism by naming certain lines of objection and indicating the methods of explanation for them.

Critics found in the Homeric narratives *ἀδύνατα*—i.e. incidents impossible, not real, not true to life, as in the account of the pursuit of Hektor (X 205 ff.) (12 examples in scholia); or *ἄλογα*, irrational or improbable elements, as the account of the putting out of Odysseus by the Phaiakians on the shores of Ithaka (O 119 ff.) (16 examples in scholia); or *βλαβερὰ*, the 'morally hurtful,' of which Plato made so much; or *ὑπεναντία*, i.e. contradictions or inconsistencies in statement, as the incident of the slain Pylaimenes following the corpse of his son Harpalion on its way to sacred Ilium (cf. E 576, N 658) (20 examples in scholia); or *ἀπρεπῆ*, the unbecoming in character, a term usually applied to the poetic representations of the gods (18 examples in scholia); or *τὸ ἀνώμαλον*, the inconsistent in character, charged against the Homeric Achilles, whom Aristotle justifies as being *ὁμαλῶς ἀνώμαλον*.

How, now, does Aristotle proceed to justify the presence of such elements in the Homeric poems?

"It is Homer," says Aristotle, "who has taught other poets the true art of lying" (*ψευδῆ λέγειν ὡς δεῖ* 1460 a 19). And the fact that the poems of Homer are creations of the imagination of an exceedingly clever sort by the supreme master of fiction leads the philosopher to lay down three fundamental considerations for his explanations of alleged poetic faults.

A. The standard of artistic correctness in poetry he finds to be altogether distinct from that of ethics and politics, in answer to Plato, who judged poetry by ethical and utilitarian considerations. Faults are justifiable, if through them the end of poetry is more truly realized, and this with Aristotle is pleasure, the heightened and delighted wonder experienced in the perusal of marvellous fictions. For the sake of affording pleasure the poet invents extraordinary characters, whose words and actions, however, are poetically true. This plausibility of representation imposes upon us sufficiently for the purposes of poetry, and leads us to believe for the moment all the *ἀδύνατα* and *ἄλογα*, marvellous and incredible fictions we should otherwise have rejected. So the story of the putting out of Odysseus, irrational though it be, we accept because of the poetic charm with which the poet invests his narration. There may be in the poem, moreover, faults

or inaccuracies, judged by the standard of other arts; but these are minor details and do not affect the poetry as such. "It is a less error not to know that a doe has no horns than to paint one badly." Thus Aristotle asserts for poetry a purely aesthetic standard. And in the scholia we find this appeal to the aesthetic standard, whether from a study of the characters or the poetic situation, more than thirty-five times, for the solution of *ἄλογα*, *ἄδύνατα*, *ὑπερναντία*, *ἀπρεπῆ*, and other objections.

B. As the poet is an imitator, the objects of representation must be either (1) actual events, or (2) current traditions or popular belief, or (3) the universal, the ideal, the 'higher reality.' The third may be designated as poetic truth.

This representation of 'what ought to be,' in the aesthetic sense, leads frequently to the introduction of *ἄδύνατα*, *ἄλογα*, etc., judging from our ordinary standards, but which are, notwithstanding, in a higher sense poetically true. If the poet introduces these elements artistically, in a credible and natural manner, we involuntarily accept for the moment his fallacies.

But though the poet's thought is thus free and eternal, yet usage and tradition determine largely the form in which he clothes it. Accordingly, in his narrations about the gods, the poet can merely embody in his poetry current traditions and popular belief. This is a final answer to the censures of Plato and other philosophers. Men say so and believe so, says Aristotle, and the poet with right accommodates himself to the popular views. This method of explanation finds striking confirmation in the scholia, where it is frequently used to explain *ἀπρεπῆ*, *ἄδύνατα*, and *ἄλογα*. Furthermore, the poet is compelled to represent the customs of the time he is depicting, actual events of that time, though to men of later times they seem impossible and incredible. And in the scholia the custom is appealed to in more than a dozen passages to explain *ἄδύνατα*, *ἀπρεπῆ*, and *ὑπερναντία*.

C. Poetic diction, the means of representation, has received much attention at the hands of Aristotle. He recognizes poetic license in the use of language, and that many alleged faults can be removed by a consideration of the linguistic expression. In more than thirty-five passages of the scholia occur explanations of objections by some criticism or interpretation of the Homeric diction, illustrating observations of Aristotle in the *Poetics*. In some cases we see the explanation of rare and difficult words; in others, changes in accent or punctuation, or other critical comments and emendations. Sometimes we see a difficulty removed by a study of the ambiguity of an expression, sometimes by an appeal to the custom of speech, sometimes by a consideration of the various possibilities of meaning in a word, — all of which methods of explanation are briefly treated in c. xxv.

12. The Origin of the Gerundive, by Professor Edwin W. Fay, of Washington and Lee University.

This paper appears in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

13. The Pronunciation of Genitives in *-i* from Substantives in *-ius* and *-ium*, by Professor E. M. Pease, of the Leland Stanford Junior University.

The traditional view advocated by the writers on this subject, that "an accent originally on the antepaenultima remains on the paenultima, according to the

grammarians, in contracted vocatives and genitives of *-io*-stems" (Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*), was called in question by a study of the relation of the verse-ictus and the word-accent in a portion of Plautus and Terence. The harmony of verse-ictus and word-accent proves to be closer than is generally supposed, and it was noticed that most of the instances in which they fail to agree fall into interesting groups. For instance, such words as *mûliërem*, *bênefici* and the like, form one group of exceptions, as Lindsay has already pointed out.

These genitives of *-io*-stems also fail to conform to the rule suggested by Nigidius Figulus, and now current in all the handbooks. It therefore seemed worth while to trace the usage through all of Plautus and Terence and the other Republican poets. In the six plays of Terence there are forty-seven instances of this genitive in *i*. Eliminating all cases with long penult, like *negôti* and *testimôni*, and all dissyllables, like *fili*, *preti*, there remain nineteen examples of polysyllables with short penult; e.g., *auxili*, *cônsili*, *ingeni*. These all, with two exceptions, receive the ictus on the antepenult, and the secondary accent on the ultima. One exception is *bênefici*, And. 44, which belongs to the group above referred to; and the other is *cônsili*, And. 320, where the primary verse-accent is on the final syllable and the secondary on the first. In no instance does the verse-accent fall on the penult. In Plautus there are sixty-two instances of polysyllables with short penults. All but nine conform to the normal usage of pronunciation, and receive the primary ictus on the antepenult. Of these nine exceptions, there are five cases where the last syllable receives the primary accent and the antepenult the secondary accent; in one instance, through the elision of the final *i*, the word receives no accent, in another the metre is uncertain; the other two are instances of *bênefici* and *indelfici*. These apparent exceptions only strengthen the rule; and of all the cases there is not one where the short penult receives the verse-accent, primary or secondary.

The results of the investigation in the other poets of the Republican period are identical with those in Plautus and Terence. Though the passages are often fragmentary and it is difficult to determine with certainty the position of the ictus, there is still no clear case of the verse-accent falling on the short penult. There are several instances where the ultima receives the ictus, and where the first syllable of a quadrisyllabic word is accented. This array of instances violating the special rule laid down by Nigidius seemed at the time the paper was read as conclusive evidence that there was no basis for the current pronunciation; but after recently considering the question anew and realizing more clearly than before the large number of instances in which the antepenult in these genitives is long, and the difficulty the poet would have in accenting the penult, there is reason to doubt whether the instances which are really fitting are numerous enough to warrant us in drawing any conclusion. We are perhaps forced to accept, for the Republican period, the principle this paper intended to prove, if we accept the view of Brugmann, Stolz, and others, that the genitive of nouns in *-ius* and *-ium* originally ended in single *i*; for it is hardly possible that the Romans would accent the short penult in these genitives, if the single *i* were not the resultant of an earlier *ii*.

Remarks were made by Professors Lodge, Ashmore, and Gudeman, and in reply by the author.

14. Achilles and Ajax at Dice: A Vase in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, by Miss Lida Shaw King, of the Packer Collegiate Institute.

On a recently acquired black-figured lecythus in the Perkins Collection of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts are represented Achilles and Ajax playing dice, with Athena between them. The vase is a lecythus of the archaic type, and from its technique may be dated between 530 and 550 B.C., though the inscription, especially the form of θ , might suggest a later date.¹ It is black-figured on red ground; the flesh parts of Athena are in white; purple is used as a subordinate decoration for hair and beard and on the armor; the eyes, in profile, of the heroes are round, while that of Athena is oval. Inner details are incised. Achilles (left) and Ajax (right) are seated upon squared slabs. In the left hand each holds two spears, which rest upon the left shoulder. They face each other and are bent forward, each bringing his right hand upon a low, pedestal-like stone that lies between them, in front of which stands Athena. She faces to our left, her right arm extending above Achilles' head, while the lower part of her body is turned to the right, and she seems to be moving rapidly. The heroes are bareheaded; they both wear the loin-cloth, cuirass, and greaves. Their helmets, of the Corinthian type, with crests, and their shields, of the Boeotian type, are stacked behind them. Athena wears a crested helmet and an aegis, and in her left hand poises her spear horizontally. Above the heads of Achilles and Ajax are inscribed their names (in the nominative): (1) Ἀχιλλεύς (*sic*), perhaps meant for Ἀχιλ(λ)εύς, and (2) Αἴας, while near Athena's is her name (in the genitive): (3) Ἀθηνᾶας (*sc. εἰκὼν* or *εἶδος*).

The inscriptions of this vase are of especial interest, as will be seen from the facsimiles below; they are in the Old Attic alphabet and exhibit certain noteworthy peculiarities. In front of the heroes, and written up and down the vase, are the words which each is supposed to be saying. Achilles says (4) τέτ(τ)αρα φέρω, 'I score four'; Ajax, (5) δύο φέρω, 'I score two.'

(1) Δ + Ι √ √ √ ζ (2) Δ Ι Α ζ
(3) Δ Θ Ε √ Α Α ζ
(4) Τ Ε Τ Α Δ Α Θ Ε Ο Ο
(5) Δ √ Ο Θ Ε Δ Ο

The inscription makes it highly probable that the artist conceives this scene as of a game of dice (κύβοι), and not a game of backgammon (παισσί), which is not infrequently figured in much the same fashion.

The vase belongs to a series comprising not less than forty specimens, mostly without inscriptions, proceeding, at least in one case, from such a well-known artist as Execias (Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, fig. 744). The series has been cata-

¹ On the François vases the two forms of θ (\oplus and \odot) occur together.

logued by Kjellberg and briefly discussed by Robert. We may regard the type as originally representing a genre scene: two Greek warriors, partially armed, while engaged on picket duty amuse themselves either at dice or at backgammon. The artist of this vase has given them the names of Achilles and Ajax. The different manner of designating the heroes and Athena (the former in the nominative, the latter in the genitive), and the odd perspective, whereby the upper part of Athena is in the background, while the lower part is in the foreground in front of the players, suggests that the figure of Athena is perhaps a later addition, and that the goddess is conceived as invisible to the players, though present in spirit to warn them of the danger of attack from unsuspected enemies. A later treatment transforms this figure into a statue of the goddess on a pedestal, and this in turn leads to a new conception of the scene. Various theories about these vases were cited and discussed in the paper.

The paper was presented for the author by Professor Wright. Remarks were made by Professor Perrin, Miss King, Professor Smyth, Dr. Huddilston, and Professor Earle.

15. The Literary Relationship of Juvenal to Martial, by Dr. Harry Langford Wilson, of Johns Hopkins University.

In all the field of Roman literature there are perhaps no two writers who are more closely related, or throw more light each on the other, than Juvenal and Martial. So many coincidences of thought and expression crowd upon the attention of the reader of these authors that the question arises, How are we to account for these similarities, so numerous and striking? Is it sufficient to say with a recent editor — I mean Friedlaender — that they portray the social conditions of the same age? Some explanation going far deeper is, in my opinion, rendered necessary by the phenomena which present themselves when the two poets are placed side by side. As far as the chronological aspect of the question is concerned, the statement of the *Vitae* ("ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit"), the silence of Martial in XII. 18 with regard to Juvenal's poetic activity, — and on this point I am inclined to lay stress, — and the tone of the satires themselves, looking back as they do on the past, often on the distant past, are best explained if we assume that Juvenal not only did not publish, but did not write, satire before the appearance of the last of Martial's epigrams, the twelfth book, in the year 101/102. Upon this probable hypothesis we proceed in considering the influence of the earlier upon the later writer.

One of the most striking features of the Roman poetry of imperial times is the almost universal dependence of the poet upon his predecessors. True of all literature in a greater or less degree, this phenomenon is nowhere more marked than in the poetry of the Silver Age. The poet of the period employed the regular poetic phraseology, which had reached its highest development in the time of Augustus and long since become stereotyped. It would therefore be a great mistake to suppose that every time we meet a passage in Valerius Flaccus or Statius which recalls a turn of expression in some poet of the preceding century, we must infer that the later was of set purpose imitating the earlier poet. No doubt indisputable examples of imitation can be pointed out in any book

of the *Argonautica* or *Thebais*, but by far the larger number of such coincidences of expression are quite unintentional and result from unconscious reminiscence. But when we turn to Martial and Juvenal the question is a very different one. Here we are considering the influence, not of a poet of the preceding century whose works were familiar to all from childhood, but of a contemporary and friend, who, it should not be forgotten, stood further than any other poet of that day from those rhetorical tendencies so pronounced in Juvenal. In view of the intimate social relations existing between the two poets, and the fact that Juvenal is mentioned in Martial VII. 24 and addressed in VII. 91 and XII. 18, we must, it seems to me, assume for the satirist such familiarity with the epigrams as to reduce to a minimum the possibility of his unconsciously repeating their thought or phraseology.

The literary relationship of Juvenal to Martial is not now brought to notice for the first time. Many years ago W. S. Teuffel called attention to some of the parallel passages, in a foot-note to his essay on Juvenal (*Studien und Charakteristiken*, 1871, p. 416). More recently Henry Nettleship, in his "Life and Poems of Juvenal" (*Journal of Philology*, XVI. 1888, p. 41 ff.), devoted several pages to this question, advancing the theory that "during the greater part of Domitian's reign Martial and Juvenal virtually worked together." But this view has won little acceptance, is not, as far as I know, now held by any one, and must for reasons already suggested be considered untenable. The next important utterance on this subject came from L. Friedlaender, who, reviewing Nettleship's essay in *Bursian's Jahresbericht* (1892), expressed the opinion that the correspondences in question are for the most part accidental, and that only for one passage (Juv. V. 147) should intentional reference to Martial be assumed. In his edition of Juvenal (1895) he has nothing to say about the influence of Martial, even in his note to the passage just mentioned.

In attempting to discover the attitude of Juvenal toward his friend's work, with which he was so familiar, let us first consider passages similar in both expression and thought, and in some instances even in their context.¹ No one would think of denying a conscious reminiscence of Martial on the part of Juvenal in the following parallel:

"Boletum qualem Claudius edit, edas" (M. I. 20, 4)

"boletus domino, sed quales Claudius edit

ante illum uxoris, post quem nihil amplius edit" (Juv. V. 147).

The words are the same in both cases, conveying the same thought in the same connection, and this is the passage referred to by Friedlaender in the remark already mentioned. Cases of this kind, in which both thought and language are similar, are by no means as numerous as might be expected,—not more than six in all. Sometimes, too, the similarity does not extend beyond a single word, and that a word not at all unusual. It is therefore quite clear that Juvenal, in a period when wholesale and unreserved appropriation of the work of others was the rule, refrained almost entirely from this most direct method of borrowing, as far as Martial was concerned.

¹ For present purposes I have selected a few representative illustrations. All the material upon which the conclusions of this paper are based appears in the *American Journal of Philology*, XIX. 1898, pp. 193-209.

But there is still a considerable number of Juvenal passages in which we see verbal coincidence with Martial. The most remarkable feature of these exact verbal repetitions is that, while the words, as far as the likeness goes, are the same, the general point of view is different, the immediate thought expressed is not the same, and the words themselves have usually a different application and often an entirely different meaning. Now there can in my opinion be little doubt that Juvenal rarely, if ever, repeated words or phrases occurring in the epigrams without knowing they were Martial's. Whether he was in every, or even in any, case aware that he was adapting Martial's language to another point of view or giving it a new meaning, is a different question, and of course one which does not admit of a certain answer. It is true that the words of an old author sometimes remain in the memory when their context and real meaning have been forgotten; but it is improbable that Juvenal, in the case of his contemporary and friend, remembered the words apart from their meaning and connection. To my mind, the evidence points toward a probability not only that Juvenal was conscious of using expressions found in Martial, but that he for the most part allowed himself to borrow them only when his point of view or thought was not the same. In one instance the leading word is to be understood literally in Martial, but metaphorically in Juvenal:

"ardeat illa licet" (Mart. VIII. 59, 12)

"ardeat ipsa licet" (Juv. VI. 209).

The former refers to a burning *lucerna*, the latter to a woman in love. In one case Juvenal uses literally the expression employed by Martial in a figurative sense:

"Stat contra dicitque tibi tua pagina 'Fur es'" (Mart. I. 53, 12)

"stat contra starique iubet" (Juv. III. 290).

The latter passage is taken from the description of the dangers that threatened the unattended pedestrian in the streets of Rome at night. As a last instance in which the same phrase has very different meaning in the two poets, we may quote Juvenal's words about the astrologer:

"Nemo mathematicus genium indemnatus habebit" (Juv. VI. 562);

that is to say, the narrower his escapes and the more severe his hardships, the more implicit the faith of the people in his skill. Martial, on the contrary, using the same expression, *genium habere*, referred to the qualities of a good book:

"Victurus genium debet habere liber" (Mart. VI. 60, 10).

But there is a larger class of parallels in which the repeated words or phrases, though used in the same or almost the same sense, are found in an entirely different context and have reference to persons or things of a totally different character. For example, Martial speaks of true fame with the words

"Notumque per oppida nomen" (III. 95, 7),

whereas Juvenal in the same words gives vent to his scorn:

"Notaeque per oppida buccae" (III. 35).

A large majority, however, of the cases in which the influence of Martial on Juvenal may be considered possible consists of passages dissimilar in phraseology, alike only in thought. Seventy-seven such instances can be reported. In these, as a rule, while the thought expressed in the particular verse, and sometimes even in the whole context, is exactly the same as in Martial, the avoidance of the same words is apparently so studied as to strengthen the conviction that in such cases the satirist was unwilling to borrow the exact words of his friend. If Martial's sentence is brief and plain, Juvenal's is often extended and rhetorical without adding any really new idea, though the converse of this is sometimes true, when Juvenal expresses himself in a briefer and even condensed form. In some places, too, where Martial has employed the usual word in the connection, Juvenal uses a rare synonym. In a similar manner the writer of the lost *Epitome* seems to have altered the language of Livy (cf. E. Wölfflin, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, XI. 1898, pp. 2 and 7). All this becomes clearer as we examine the parallel passages.

"Quod tam grande sophos clamat tibi turba togata,
Non tu, Pomponi, cena diserta tua est" (Mart. VI. 48)

"quanto Faesidium laudat vocalis agentem
sportula?" (Juv. XIII. 32 f.).

Here, as in other cases following, exactly the same thought is presented without the repetition of a single word. And it is interesting to observe how the different ideas of the one writer are represented in the other. *Laudat vocalis* corresponds to *sophos clamat*, *sportula* to *turba togata* and *cena*, *agentem* to *diserta*, and *quanto* (sc. clamore) to *tam grande*.

"Quaeque trahi multo marmora fune vides" (Mart. V. 22, 8)

"Nam si procubuit qui saxa Ligustica portat
axis" (Juv. III. 257 f.).

The same picture is before the mind of each poet, the crowded streets of Rome, in which the pedestrian was always in danger; but the *marmora* of Martial is the *saxa Ligustica* of Juvenal, and *trahi fune* corresponds to *portat axis*. So in describing a fish too large for any platter,

"Quamvis lata gerat patella rhombum,
Rhombus latior est tamen patella" (Mart. XIII. 81)

"Sed derat pisci patinae mensura" (Juv. IV. 72),

the satirist uses *patina* instead of *patella*, *piscis* instead of *rhombus*, and expresses the sense of *lata* by the noun *mensura*.

To say that all these coincidences of thought and expression are due only to accident and environment seems to me to be out of the question. Assuming for the satirist, as I think we are justified in doing, perfect familiarity with the *Epigrams*, we are led to the conclusion that Juvenal, with the few and for the most part unimportant exceptions mentioned in the early part of this paper, avoided expressing the same thought in the same way as Martial, though he allowed himself to borrow Martial's words when thought and point of view were different.

Moreover, the fact that this principle with almost perfect regularity explains the relation of the parallel passages to each other gives strong probability to the theory that this was Juvenal's conscious attitude. At all events, even if this be not conceded,—and of course demonstration is impossible,—surely it may never be affirmed that the literary influence of Martial upon Juvenal was slight, or limited to a single passage.

16. The Date of Ovid's Banishment, by Dr. W. S. Burrage, of Harvard University.

Our only information as to the date of Ovid's banishment comes from two volumes of letters which the poet wrote during his exile. Of these two volumes, the *Tristia* alone shows finish and skilful arrangement, whereas the *Ex Ponto* is merely a disorderly bunch of letters (cf. *P.* III. 9. 51-54).

From his letters we learn that Ovid put to sea in winter; but there is doubt whether he reached Tomi that same winter or in the following summer. On this point, Ovid's own statements as to his route and rate of progress yield scant satisfaction. We know that he left his ship at Tempyra in Thrace; but his subsequent route is not certainly known. His accounts of winds and delays neutralize each other.

The sixth and thirteenth letters in the fourth book of the *Ex Ponto* give us statements which enable us to make a near guess at the wished-for date. The thirteenth letter was written after Augustus' death (vv. 25, 26), and in the sixth winter of Ovid's stay at Tomi (v. 40). That this letter was written in the next winter after the death of Augustus is rendered probable by the sixth letter, where we learn that Augustus had recently died (vv. 15-18), and that Ovid had been in Tomi five years (vv. 5, 6). Now, if we date the thirteenth letter later than the winter of 14/15, we shall have to assume that Ovid reached Tomi as late as the winter of 10/11 or the spring-summer of 10—dates on which it would be too late to speak of Augustus as a 'newly-made immortal.'

Assuming the winter of 14/15 as the date of the thirteenth letter, the winter of 9/10 must be accounted Ovid's first winter in Tomi. Moreover, since Ovid was already fifty years old when he went into exile (*Tr.* IV. 8. 33; 10. 95-98), and was born on the twentieth of March, 43 B.C. (*Tr.* IV. 10. 5, 6, 13, 14), his banishment cannot have taken place before the last part of the year 8. Hence those who believe that Ovid's first winter in Tomi is identical with the winter in which he left Rome, adopt November-December, A.D. 9, as the date of Ovid's leaving Rome; while for those who hold that he could not have arrived in Tomi till the following spring or summer, the date of his leaving Rome has to be thrown back a year, to November-December, A.D. 8.

To determine which of these two dates is the more probable, we select all the letters which have any value for us, and assign a date to each, looking at each letter from the points of view of the supporters of either theory. A comparison of the two sets of dates may lead us to feel that the weight of probability is on one side or the other.

In this task of dating, we claim the right to be unhampered by the present order of the letters. We have referred to the disorder which reigns in the *Ex Ponto*; nor is the order of the separate letters in each book of the *Tristia* in any

way sacred. The words "electum opus," applied by implication to the *Tristia* (*P.* III. 9. 54), would seem to favor the idea that the order in the books of the *Tristia* is not chronological, but rather such as to produce rhetorical effect. The first book of the *Tristia* was written first, and the fifth book was written after the first four (cf. *Tr.* V. 1. 1, 2). Then Ovid seems to have changed his plan of attack and to have resorted to more direct appeals. At this time he wrote those letters which are contained in *Ex Ponto* I.-III. The fact that this portion of the *Ex Ponto* has prologue and epilogue seems to mark it off from the letters contained in *Ex Ponto* IV., and it must be regarded as the earlier of the two portions of this volume.

After dating the letters, we glance over the two sets of dates and find the following inconsistencies:

(1) If Ovid reached Tomi in the winter of 9/10, he must have seen the Black Sea frozen over that winter. Why, then, should he manifest, in *Tristia* III. 10 such a naïve wonder when he saw ice in the following winter, namely the winter of 10/11?

(2) The birthday described in *Tristia* III. 13 would seem, from the whole tone of the letter, to be the first since his arrival; but on the 'year 9 theory' it would be the second.

(3) In dating *Tristia* V. 10 in the winter of 12/13, and *Ex Ponto* II. 1 in the summer of 12, the supporters of the 'year 9 theory' violate the probability that all the letters in *Ex Ponto* are later in date than any in *Tristia*.

These are all the inconsistencies which seem to deserve mention. They are few, and it may be said that they are trivial; but it will be noticed that the difficulties all occur in the course of the 'year 9 theory.' This fact must carry some weight.

To sum up. Our speculations as to the time consumed by Ovid in his journey from Rome to Tomi, aided by some few vague data, resulted merely in the conclusion that he might have reached Tomi in the same winter in which he left Rome, or, on the other hand, might not have arrived before the following spring or summer. Next, from two letters in the *Ex Ponto* we drew the conclusion that Ovid's first winter in Tomi was that of 9/10. Consequently, Ovid's banishment could be assigned to either December, A.D. 8, or December, A.D. 9. Our next task was to examine a list of those letters to which dates could be assigned, and to date the letters, looking at each letter from the point of view of either party. Thus there came about two lists of dates. Though either list was a possible one, yet we found that the list which was founded on the year 8 ran more smoothly than the other. We conclude, therefore, that the weight of probability is in favor of December, A.D. 8, as the date of Ovid's banishment.

Remarks were made by Professor Gudeman.

17. Notes on Greek Inscriptions, by Professor James M. Paton, of Wesleyan University.

(1) The inscription published by V. W. Yorke in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xvi. 310, presents some forms not hitherto known in the epichoric alphabet of Phocis. Φ with the perpendicular stroke forming merely a diameter of

the circle and Σ with three strokes are new in Phocis though common in Boeotia. As the exact place of discovery is unknown, and the reported place, Abae, is near the Boeotian border, it seems doubtful whether the inscription should be reckoned among the examples of the Phocian alphabet.

(2) The Metropolitan Museum in New York contains a small block of marble bearing the inscription 'Αθανόδωρος Ἀγησάνδρου | Πόδιος ἐποίησε. This is the same stone published incorrectly in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, III., p. 1260, and by Loewy, *Inscripfen der griechischen Bildhauer*, No. 520, among the "bloss erdachte Inschriften." The authenticity of the inscription was proved by Richard Förster, and a facsimile published in the *Jahrbuch des archäologischen Instituts*, VI. 192. It was afterwards bought by Mr. Henry G. Marquand, and by him placed in the Museum. It is about $4\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{3}{4} \times 1$ in., having the inscription in two lines on one of the long sides. Förster's facsimile is fully $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch too long.

After a brief discussion of the paleography of the inscription, it was pointed out that one Rhodian inscription showed forms closely analogous to those of this basis. This is the list of the priests of Apollo Erethimios from 109-82 B.C., found at Theologos, and published in *Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei*, No. 730. The date agrees with that assigned to this family of Rhodian artists by Hiller von Gaertringen, and it seems not impossible that the statuette which originally belonged on this basis was brought from Rhodes to Capri. The statuette has not yet been identified, but the peculiar shape of the depression in which it was placed makes its rediscovery not impossible.

Remarks were made by Professor Sihler.

18. The Omission of the Article with Substantives after οὗτος, ὅδε, and ἐκεῖνος in Prose, by Professor J. E. Harry, of Georgetown College.

This paper is printed in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

Adjourned at 1.45.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association assembled at 1.45 P.M.

19. Was there a Letter Z in Early Latin? by Professor Karl P. Harrington, of the University of North Carolina.

The seventh letter of the Chalcidian alphabet was a *zeta*, with the form I. In very early times the seventh letter of the Latin alphabet was G. The traditional explanation of this fact is that Appius Claudius, who disliked z, banished it to make a place for his newly invented G, z being no longer needed because its sound had been the same as voiced s, which had suffered rhotacism. Z, thus banished, returned to the alphabet in the last century B.C. to transliterate Greek words.

The purpose of this paper is to argue that this tradition is groundless, inconsistent, and false, and that there was no letter z at all in the early Latin alphabet.

1. There are extant no trustworthy examples of its use in early Latin. All the supposed examples worthy of consideration are the following:—

(a) DTENOINE, on the Duenos bowl, read by some *dse noine*, by others *Duenoi*, etc., and by still others, *dienoine*. The form of the supposed letter and the connection of thought are too doubtful for any proof of the use of *z* to be based on this inscription. Besides, the cramped position of the letter suggests doctoring by a later hand (cf. FECED in the same inscription).

(b) A character that looks like *z* on coins of Cosa and in some Faliscan inscriptions, e.g. CO>A (but also COSA and CORANO), and >EXTOI (apparently for Sexti). Now, though the language of Cosa and Falerii was rather Latin than Etruscan, the fact remains that they were both Etruscan cities. It is entirely reasonable to suppose that the forms of letters used there would receive some Etruscan character. It is evident that in the coins of Cosa, where >, S, and R are used to represent the same, or nearly the same sound, that sound is the voiced *s* which in Latin passed into *r*, when it stood between two vowels, a process which we seem to observe actually going on in these examples. The regular Etruscan characters for *s* were >, >, and >. The supposed *z* here is then probably nothing but an Etruscan *s*. *S* has always been confusing to the illiterate, and is still often found written backwards (cf. > for N). When the Roman colonists in Cosa wanted to strike a coin, what easier blunder than turning the *s* round, especially when their Etruscan townsmen wrote *s* regularly that way?

(c) A fragment of the *Carmina Saliorum*, quoted by Varro in his *Lingua Latina*, and probably referred to by Velius Longus when he states that the letter *z* occurs “in *Carminibus Saliorum*.” The text, as we have it, reads *cozeulodorioso*, etc. Nobody knows what that means. Many have endeavored to emend the fragment. Perhaps the only suggestion thus far that does justice to the traditional text is “*Cosevi* (i.e. *Consivi*) *adoriose*,” where *z* would plainly be a spelling for *s*, and might have crept into the text in various ways, early or late. It would not be strange if an ancient *z*-form, due to early Etruscan influence upon the rites of the Salii, was retained through religious conservatism, till neither the priests nor the learned Varro knew the origin or meaning of the letter or the words.

In the line of negative evidence we may add that Varro quotes this fragment to illustrate the rather common use of *s* for *r*, but makes no mention of the rarer apparent *z*; that if *z* was the equivalent of voiced *s*, Varro would naturally have somewhere cited a case in its support; and, finally, that while we possess inscriptions of an earlier date than Appius Claudius containing examples of intervocalic *s*, like *Numasioi* and *Toitesiai*, they exhibit no sign of an intervocalic *z*.

2. Appius Claudius could not have banished *z* if it had been in use. For, (a) he must have banished voiced *s* also, if he desired to avoid letters whose sound “reminded him of a grinning skull”; but intervocalic *s* began to disappear before Claudius. (b) The history of spelling reform from the days of the imperial Claudius to the present generation teaches that while learned individuals may adopt innovations in spelling, the masses are so tenacious of the old ways that if the letter *z* really represented a common sound in the language, all the power of Appius Claudius would have been unavailing to uproot it so thoroughly from its place as to leave no more traces of it than those which actually are found. (c) The aetiological methods of making Roman history—military, political, or

linguistic—which prevailed at Rome are sufficient to explain the connection of Appius Claudius with the legend. Indeed, the invention of another letter, *r*, was attributed to him, of course falsely.

3. The sound of Chalcidian *z* was foreign to the Romans, and, like the aspirates *th*, *ch*, and *ph*, was never taken into the Latin alphabet at all. At the period when the Latin alphabet was first recognized, the sound of Chalcidian *z* was probably *dz* or *ts*, like that preserved in the other Italic dialects. The Romans used no double consonant signs, with the exception of *xx*; and the early forms *saxsum*, *vicsit*, and *vixcit* throw some doubt on the real sound of early Latin *x*. Even such letters as *l* and *s* were not doubled in Latin till the time of Ennius, whatever may have been their pronunciation. Therefore, it seems extremely unlikely that the Romans adopted a letter whose sound represented a combination for the existence of which we have no evidence, and which seems to have been avoided by assimilation or loss wherever it did occur. When in the later days of the Republic *z* was needed to transliterate Greek words, the sound of Greek *zeta* had changed, and the confusion with voiced *s* might easily arise. Then the earlier absence of *z* from the alphabet, having become a subject of curious inquiry, might have been explained by the Appius Claudius myth.

Furthermore, the form of the Chalcidian *zeta* in the early days of Rome was almost universally *I*. In Etruria, for instance, numerous examples prove this. How, then, could the Romans have suddenly become possessed of the form *z* for it? This was rather the regular Etruscan form for *s*.

Similarity of form between the seventh and ninth letters of the early Latin alphabet might possibly have contributed towards the loss of the seventh, if any such loss were to be assumed.

20. Did Agricola invade Ireland? by Professor Alfred Gudeman, of the University of Pennsylvania.

The credit of recognizing the incorrectness of the traditional interpretation of ch. 24 in Tacitus' *Agricola* belongs to Pfitzner, who, in an article published in 1882, maintained that the passage referred to is intelligible only on the supposition of an actual invasion of Ireland by the Roman general.

His view has, however, been either ignored or summarily rejected. This was due in part, no doubt, to the tenacity of tradition, but partly also to the fact that some of Pfitzner's arguments were pure assumptions, a circumstance which essentially weakened the validity of his conclusions.

It was the purpose of this paper to vindicate, if possible, this new interpretation, by utilizing the convincing arguments adduced by Pfitzner, but above all by adding a number of weighty considerations which he had strangely overlooked.

The passages upon which the solution of the question under discussion is based extend from ch. 22 to ch. 25. Now an analysis of these chapters will readily suggest the following observations.

In the first place it will be noticed that Tacitus devotes a single short chapter to each of the three years, from 80–83 A.D., his aim being to lead up to the crowning event of Agricola's campaign, which is treated at length.¹

¹ See *Amer. Philol. Assoc. Proceedings*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. xlviii ff.

In ch. 22 we are told that he had already advanced beyond or up to the boundaries of Caledonia, which he strongly garrisoned. No Roman general had ever reached that far, and hence the tribes then subdued are properly styled *novas gentes*. In ch. 25 he had passed far beyond Bodotria. In both these campaigns, be it observed, Agricola's *legions* crossed northern boundaries, while in the latter the *fleet* merely reconnoitred the coast.

This being so, it will at once be clear that the opening words of ch. 24 cannot well refer to another campaign against the Caledonians, for in that case it were difficult to understand why Tacitus should have here again spoken of subduing 'new races hitherto unknown,' when he had done this very thing the very year previous, and as a matter of fact this interpretation was made possible only by a violent change of the wholly unobjectionable text.¹

Secondly, if these opening words really referred to the Caledonians, the statement in ch. 25, that Agricola then (83 A.D.) for the first time utilized his fleet as an active and integral part of his forces, would involve a glaring contradiction, for it had already been so used the year previous (*nave prima transgressus*).

Thirdly, the *que* in *eamque partem*, a point also noticed by Plötzner, is incompatible with the assumption under discussion; for, according to the fixed usage of the Latin language, *que*, when uniting two sentences, never adds something that is intimately connected with the preceding. It will scarcely be contended that a campaign against Caledonians and a description of Ireland are so correlated.

Fourthly, the very term *nave transgressus* is fatal to the traditional interpretation, for Tacitus could no more have said *transgressus* 'crossed over,' if he meant that the fleet sailed from the N.W. corner of Britain *along the coast* to the Clyde, than we could say that an American fleet *crossed over* from New York to Charleston.

Fifthly, no one who has read the *Agricola* or the *Germania* with any degree of care can have failed to notice the consummate skill with which Tacitus established the transition from one chapter to another by means of a word, a phrase, or a name, which serves, so to speak, as the cue or catchword for the succeeding paragraph. I maintain that he has done so here. Cf. ch. 23 ext. *summotis velut in aliam insulam hostibus* and ch. 24 init. *nave prima transgressus . . . (sc. in aliam insulam) eamque partem . . . Hibernia*.

Finally, it must be observed that if we adopt the traditional view, Tacitus would have devoted, quite contrary to the transparent design of the treatise, an entire chapter to an irrelevant episode which seriously interrupts the continuity of the narrative,² for no motive for dragging in a brief geographical and ethnological description of Ireland at this particular juncture is conceivable.

Such are briefly the difficulties which stand in the way of the old view. We are happily, however, not confined to negative evidence, strong as its cumulative effect may be, but there are also positive indications which all point in the same direction.

In the first place, it is improbable that Agricola, who in 81 and 83 had been conducting his campaign against the Caledonians with his infantry, should sud-

¹ See *Classical Review*, October, 1897, p. 328.

² On the relevancy of the other geographical chapters and their purpose in the *Agricola*, cp. *Amer. Philol. Assoc. Proceedings*, 1.c.

denly in 81 have taken it into his head to transport his soldiers by sea, and, as he was fighting in the north in 81, he would actually have fortified his rear on his return (*tum praesidiis firmatur*, ch. 23 ext.). Such a strategic move would have been worthy of the military genius of the Spaniard, but not of an Agricola, if we are to believe Tacitus' express testimony as to his caution and skill in matters of this kind (cp. ch. 22 *adnotabant periti*, etc.).

Secondly, if ch. 24 deals with the conquest of the Caledonians, the words *copiis instruxit in spem magis quam ob formidinem* are unintelligible. In hope of what? Surely not of fighting these Caledonians some day, for that is what he had been doing and continues to do (ch. 25 ff.). 'Rather than because of fear'—but ch. 25 init. expressly refers to the fear Agricola entertained and the measures he took in consequence.

It will thus be evident that the traditional interpretation, from whatever point you look at it, is untenable. The moment, however, you assume that Tacitus is speaking of an actual invasion into Ireland, all the difficulties hitherto encountered vanish at once.

The northern barbarians having been pacified for the time being, Agricola, by means of a line of strongly garrisoned and well-provisioned forts, had relegated the enemy back as into another island. This simile, as already remarked, naturally introduces the next exploit of Agricola in 82 A.D. The invasion of Ireland itself is, however, not dwelt upon at any length, for the simple reason that it yielded no satisfactory results, for what Tacitus says of Caesar's expedition¹ is peculiarly applicable to the present instance.

What the cause of this failure was, whether due to a direct prohibition on the part of the jealous Domitian and the withdrawal of a legion, as Pitzner imagines, cannot be ascertained.

After his return Agricola fortified the places whence he had started out, in the hope of renewing the invasion at some future day under better auspices, rather than because of any fear that the Hibernians might in their turn invade Britain. Then, in order to show that this undertaking was both practicable and expedient, Tacitus very briefly touches upon some of the features of this country, wholly unknown to the Romans, and emphasizes his conviction of the ease with which the island could be subdued.

The presence, moreover, of the deposed Irish king in Agricola's camp would be very difficult to account for on any other supposition, for if Agricola had never set foot in Ireland the fear of an attack from that quarter can have been but a remote contingency, and one does not therefore understand why the Irish king should have been retained '*in speciem amicitiae*.' After the return from Ireland, however, Agricola had every reason to treat a royal exile from that quarter with caution, if not with suspicion.

In conclusion the author turned his attention to two objections to the interpretation here advocated, very recently formulated by Furneaux, in his admirable edition of the *Agricola*.

"The great and as it seems to me insuperable objection to this supposition is the

¹ Ch. 13 *divus Iulius cum exercitu Britanniam ingressus (= nave prima transgressus) quamquam prospera pugna terruerit incolas ac litore potitus est (= gentes . . . prosperis proeliis domuit eamque partem . . . copiis instruxit) potest videri ostendisse posteris quam tradidisse.*

apparent impossibility of imagining any sufficient motive which could have led Tacitus to treat such an event so cursorily, and not to help his readers by a single word to gather that Ireland had ever actually been reached."

"The achievement must have been the most remarkable on Agricola's whole career and worthy of comparison with the first Roman invasion of Britain, and his biographer might well have dwelt on its perils and successes and on his recall in the full tide of victory by a jealous tyrant, whose memory Tacitus had then no motive whatever for sparing and every motive for reproaching" (p. 45 f.).

But these objections of the distinguished editor of Tacitus are easily disposed of.

The motive for Tacitus 'to treat such an event so cursorily' is not so difficult to imagine,—it was the fiasco of the expedition itself; and as for the failure expressly to mention that Ireland was actually reached, it will be sufficient to refer to the internal and external grounds enumerated above.

In answer to the second objection, we may urge that, inasmuch as the expedition was a failure, it could not well have been the most remarkable in Agricola's whole career.'

Again, while we moderns would certainly attach considerable importance to the first contact of imperial Rome with Ireland, as we do in the case of Caesar's invasion of Britain, the ancients were far from viewing the latter event in the same light (see Furneaux himself, *Introd. Ann. vol. II. p. 128*); in fact, Tacitus plainly belittles the achievement. It is therefore in no way surprising that the same author did not wax eloquent over Agricola's unsatisfactory exploit.

Finally, it must not be forgotten that the biographer expressly disclaims any intention of attacking Domitian throughout, and he was therefore not called upon to brand the tyrant at each and every point, where his narrative gave him occasion to do so. The scathing impeachment at the close sufficed for his purpose.

21. Classical Archaeology — a new force in Classical Studies,¹ by Dr. J. H. Huddilston, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Every classical philologist ought to know something regarding all fields of classical archaeology, and ought further to be a careful student of some branch of the science, in which he has trained the eye and awakened a sympathy for the tangible remains of Greek and Roman civilization such as will bring him to feel a real kinship with those peoples. Herein lies the meaning of the word 'new' as used in the title of this paper.

It is an opportune time for glancing at the archaeological interest being aroused at present by our schools at Rome and Athens, and for inquiring briefly into the nature and history of archaeological work; and for indicating some advantages to be gained by the student of the classics in this field alone.

Classical archaeology covers, in its broadest sense, much in epigraphy, numismatics, mythology, and religion; in its narrower significance it embraces the field of art; archaeology, in a word, is occupied with all the objective, tangible remains of Greek and Roman civilization as opposed to the subjective and intangible in philosophy and literature. It is a science concerned from first to last with the product of the human hand and mind, and therefore with man himself. Herein

¹ A considerable part of this paper appears in *The Macmillan Company's Book Reviews*, October, 1898.

rests the unique value of the study—a study we may gladly welcome in the curricula of our colleges, not only for what it will do for classical philology, but also for the services it will render to the department of history and *belles lettres*.

Classical philology and archaeology were born at nearly the same time; the age of classicism that produced Winckelmann ushered in Zoega and F. A. Wolf, and for two generations the archaeologists were at the same time philologists. Welcker, G. Hermann, and O. Müller included archaeology in their courses; but with the larger discoveries of monuments the two sciences have drifted apart, until archaeology receives all too little attention from the philologist. Along this line, however, our classics must be rescued from the disrepute into which they have fallen. *Greek art in its various forms must supplement the instruction in linguistics and literature.*

22. Mute and Liquid in Bacchylides, by Professor Herbert Weir Smyth, of Bryn Mawr College.

This paper appears in full in the TRANSACTIONS.

Adjourned at 4 P.M. to attend the reception given by President and Mrs. Smith.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association convened at 8.10 P.M.

23. Latin *ai* and *ae*: Diphthong or Monophthong? by Professor E. G. Sihler, of New York University.

While accepting with grateful appreciation the positive results—largely gained by Ritschl and his school—in the domain of Latin phonetics, the present writer has long been impressed with the conviction that the current notation of *ae* = *ai* in *aisle* (in our current grammars) may be designated as premature canonization. Thus in Allen and Greenough, Harkness, Chase, Bennett '95, Mooney '97. Gildersleeve and Lodge '94, p. 2, alone are distinguished by some cautious specifications. But King and Cookson state that "the diphthong passed into the monophthong about 200–150 B.C. and was written *ae*." Stolz and Schmalz § 35: "Der Uebergang zur monophthongischen Aussprache hat sich ungefähr 550–600 u.c. vollzogen." A compromise between the first view and the last is obviously impossible.

I.

Corssen's *Aussprache Vokalismus und Betonung der Lateinischen Sprache*, 2d ed., 1868, pp. 303 sq., 324 sqq., 630, and particularly 674 sqq., seems to have accurately presented the data of the pre-Augustan inscriptions. But Ritschl's "*Der Stoff ist zerrissen und zersplittert*" (*Unsere heutige Aussprache des Latein, Rheinisches Museum*, 1876, pp. 481 sqq.) has been reëchoing ever since.—I therefore excerpted the data anew from Mommsen, *Corp. I. L.* I², with due care, returning at the end with undiminished regard to Corssen's propositions. Some supplements from Orelli-Henzen were added.

What induced the users of Latin to spell *ae* in transition from *ai*? If the

sound was not changed, why was the spelling changed? or did they actually substitute a more difficult diphthong for an easier one: did they fancy intrasyllabic hiatus? In Quintilian's day (I. 7, 18) the *ae* and *ai* spelling was clearly a matter of orthographical rather than orthoepical variation, and he (I. 7, 29) refers to it as "*tam parvae quaestionis*;" he notes *consuetudo* (conventional usage) as a bar to phonetic spelling, and spelling (of past records) as a repository of actual sound is to his mind a *pium desiderium*, I. 7, 31: 'hic enim est usus literarum ut custodiant (not quod custodiunt) voces et velut depositum reddant legentibus."

Paistano Mo. (I shall use this abbrev. instead of *C. I. L.* I².) p. 7, Gnaivod p. 16, aidiles (nom.) p. 17, aide (aedem) p. 18; quairatis, quaist. p. 20, 167 B.C. Belolai p. 23; but *Aecetiai ib.*; Lauernai p. 24; Saeturni no. 48 Mo. reads *per diaeresin*. Romai . . . Prosepnai (not nais) p. 25; airid p. 27; de praidad p. 27; Gemelai p. 30; (n)umtorai no. 122: Vehiliai, p. 31; Fameliai n. 166; Menervai n. 191; but *praedad* in Col. Rostr. 260 B.C. *Aedem* in S. C. de Bac. 186 B.C. (no. 196 Mo.), but *Duelonai* ai quom, tabelai datai. In the *lex Repetundarum* p. 49, Mo., 123 or 122 B.C. *quaestionem*, *quaeret*, *quaerat*, *conquaeri*, *praetorei* and *-i*, but also *quaerundai*, *conciliai*: clearly *ae* is gaining on *ai*. Ins. of 117 B.C. p. 72 *Caecilio* (2) L. *Caecilio* (1) § 29; 111 B.C., p. 75: *quaeque*, *gnatae*, *quae*, *primae*, *aedificium*, *aerarium*, *praes*, *Romae*, *scripturae*; p. 82 *praes*, *praevides*; p. 84 *peguniae* *Massinissae*; p. 107 (era of Social war 91-89 B.C.) *sub aede Kastorus*; p. 108 (a law of Sulla, 81 B.C.) *aerarium*, *quaestor*, *scribae*, — an inscription, by the by, which illustrates the innovations of Accian orthography: *pequatuu*, *iuus*, *aa ceteris* (cf. Brambach *Die Neugestaltung der Lateinischen Orthographie*, p. 19). The *ai* disappears almost completely: recurring in formulae mainly; cf. the analogy of *coiraverunt* (-vere), *coeraverunt*, *curaverunt*, *oitile*, and *utile* (Mo. p. 107) the latter being the actual pronunciation, *af vobis* being strictly phonetic spelling in same inscr.; both *foidere* and *foedere*, *ib.*; Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I. p. 185) suggests, *Die von der Schrift abhaengige Aussprache der Gebildeten*: query: von welcher Schrift? Regular instruction in Latin grammar was late in Rome, Sueton. *Grammat.* 1; Aelius Stilo being the first grammarian of the *alter ordo*, one generation before Varro himself. Of coins (Mo. 128 sqq.) *Γaetus* (oldest P in conjunction with *ae*) no. 258; 260 *Aesti*, 264 *Baebi*, 267 *A. Caee*, 287 *Maini*, 310 *Caisar*, 317, 364 *Laeca*; 320 *Aili*, 376 *Caesi*, 383 *Blasio*, 389 *Caesar*; 422 *Aed. Pl.*; 452 *Nae.*, 460 *Plaetorius*; 466 *Hupsaeus*, 469 *Iudaeus*.

In the funeral Inscr. (Mo. no. 1007, line 2): *pulcrae feminae*; n. 1148 *praitores aere martis emeru.*, 1192 (Formiae) *Mevius aid.* (*maevius aedil.*), 1202 *non aevo exsacto vitai*; 1207 (Capua) *Philemae* . . . *ama[nt] issumai*. Other juxtaposition of archaic and phonetic spelling: n. 1230 *portas turreis moiros turreisque aequas qum moiro faciundum coiraverunt*. n. 1280 *scaina* (pronounce scēnam) *fac. coir*; 1341 *scaenarium* (pr. scēnarium). In the consular lists of the *Fasti Capitolini* we have *Laenas*, *Laetorius*, *Caedicius*, *Caecilius*, *Blaesus*, *Caepio*, *Scaevula*, *Paetus*; but the ultra-patrician gens of the *Aemilii* almost uniformly appears as *Aimilius*: a. u. c. 437, 443, 499, 524, 529, 538, 567, 572, 575, 579, 586, 596, 676, 709. *Paetus* (3) *Mainius* (1). Did this aristocratic distinction appeal to the eye alone? Even more palpably orthoepical was the representation of *ai* by the Emperor *Claudius*: we will readily see that the innovation was doomed to failure because not even the princeps could restore a defunct sound; cf. of Claudian era *Orelli I. 714, Caisare* . . . *Invictai* . . . *Aidius* . . . *SerJiliae*; n. 716 *Medullinae* . . .

Sponsae Paidagogus: orthographic assimilation towards Greek was probably, *per se*, feasible, but orthoepic repristination was impossible; cf. of Trajan's era, Orelli I. 782 *Nervae* and *Nervai*. In *Pianta di Roma* (era of Sept. Severus) in close juxtaposition: *Aquæductum*, *Aedis Musai*!

Phonetic spellings pointing towards German *ee* or *ä*: Mo. n. 64 *Fortune* (dat.); n. 168 *Cesula* . . . *Diane* (dat.); n. 183 *Victorie* (dat.); in lex *Thoria* 111 B.C. Mo. p. 75, l. 7 *edificium*: l. 18 *aedificium*; l. 38 *colonie*; scaenam transcribes *σκηνή* p. 121; *Murena* from *muraena* (cf. Varro *R.R.* 3, 3, 10, not 3, 10 Freund, who copied the slip from his Forcellini); cf. coin in Mo. 348, and Fast. Cap. a.u.c. 731; ΜΥΣΤΑΙ PIEI n. 580; *Muste* n. 578; *Remurine* n. 810 Mo. takes as dat.; 910 *Mevius*; 1432 *Sibi et amande*; p. 474 *Auest.*; p. 478 *exs Traechia* f. *Θρηκη*; era of Vespas. Orelli I. 748 *alae* (gen.) *Getulorum*; phonetic equivalence of *ē* and *ae*; Nero's time: *ib.* 731 *Divae Poppeae*; 733 *Poppaiae*; and A.D. 100 *Sacerdotæ* as abl.! Or. I. 35, era of Trajan, *Mausolæi*; 193 A.D. *æi* *permissum* (ei) Or. I. 39; *ib.* *Sæio*; I. 71, *natus Aquileiē*; I. 80, *caetera*; *ib.* 104 *prēdia* . . . *que* (quae)—undated; 123 *pretor* (n. d.) 1; a Greek nom. plur. I believe, Or. I. 150 *Cauloniatai* (Magna Graecia).

The gen. *-aes* mainly of *Libertae* of Greek nativity, Mo. n. 1025 *Aquilliaes Tertiae*; n. 1212 *Pescenniaes* . . . *Laudicaes* (Λαοδίκης) 1242 *Dianaes*; 1253 *Heraes*; Henzen 5376: *Europa Antoniaes Drusi* (died 9 B.C.); 5411 *Statiliaes* . . . *Actes*; 5413 *Claudie* (gen.) *Actes* L. *Eurydices*; Or. I. 631 *Rhoemetalcaes*. The Greek habits of these *Libertae* induced even the inoculation of the phonetic equivalent of *-ης* on distinctively Roman names (Corssen, p. 684): *Octaviaes Flaviaes*, *Corneliaes*, *Licinaes*, etc., etc., is the phonetic equivalent to *Monimes*, *Nymphes*, *Tyches*, *Irenes*, etc., etc., Corss. p. 685, to which add A. VETTI CONVIVAES on a signet from the domus *Vettiorum* at Pompeii, probably exhibiting the phonetic habits of the Greek carver. The theories based on *Prosepnais* have collapsed with that reading itself: Mo. p. 25. Corssen, p. 687, properly, I think, urges against Bücheler (*Grundriss d. lat. Declination*, 2 ed. p. 65) that we must in nowise associate this *-aes* with the *sermo rusticanus* of native Latin usage; its decisive importance in our inquiry I need not emphasize.

II.

Lucilius (ed. Lachmann-Vahlen) v. 276 *muraenas*, 21 *caenam*, 378 *cenam*; *erumna* in 562, 603, 703; *aerumna* 842; *vegrandi* 573; — on *erumna* cf. Charisius Keil, I. p. 98, 12; *caelum*: *Aelius Stilo* from *caelatum* or *celatum*, Varro L. L. V. 18; *Caelius* from *Celes Vibenna*, V. 46; *aedus* from *edus*, V. 97; *sepio*, *ib.* 141, 150, 162, VII. 13; *esculum*, V. 152; *seclum*, VI. 11; *faenore*, *ib.* 65; *scenici*, 76; *exqueras*, *ib.* 91; *ceruleo*, VII. 48; *scaena* and *scena*, *ib.* 96; *faeneratrix* and *fen*. *Faenisicia* and *Fen*.

The *-āi* termination in Ennius, Lucilius, Cicero (*aquāi*, *Nepāi*), Lucretius are due to prosody: the postulate of a spondee. Cf. Th. Birt, *Rh. M.* '97, suppl. band, p. 4.

III.

Of Lucilius' spondaic *-ai* J. M. Stowasser (*Wölflin's Archiv*, I. p. 200) asserts that "*die diphthongische Aussprache des Gen. ai für Lucilius*" was "*sicher Utopie*," in the case of Lucretius it was "*bewusstes Archaisiren*."

Nigidius Figulus' discrimination (Gellius, *N. A.* 13, 26, 4) of *huius terrai* and *huic terraē* was certainly intended not for the eye alone. Festus (prob. Verrius Flaccus himself) s.v. *ae* cites *aulai*, *pictai musai*, the first two Vergilian: Quintil. I. 7, 18 calls Vergil in this connection "amantissimus vetustatis." This is iterated in Charisius (Keil, I. 279, 4), Diomedes (Keil, I. 442, 11), Priscian (K. II. p. 37). The inaccuracy of the Grammatici in speaking of a poetic *dat. ai* is scored by Lachmann on Lucretius, I. 454.

But Terentius Scaurus, the Hadrianic grammarian, seems to bear witness to the diphthongic character of *ae*, Keil, VII. 16 (on the corrupt character of the MSS. in this pass. see Keil's footnote): "*et apud antiquos scriptores I littera pro ea (pro e?) scribebatur, ut testantur μεταπλάσμοι in quibus est eiusmodi syllabarum ductio ut pictai vestis et aulai medio (the Vergilian examples again) pro pictae et aulae. Sed magis in illis e novissima sonat et propterea (sic) antiqui quoque (sic) Graecorum hanc syllabam per ae scripsisse traduntur.*" Now was it the intention of Ter. Sc. on theoretical and historical grounds ("ratio") as over against the actual practice ("consuetudo") of an *ä?* or *ē?* as *au* perhaps was urged as over against an actual pronunciation of *ō?* to what does he refer by the words *in illis?* what is the standard of comparison in *magis?* does he urge theoretically, or does he analyze the actual pronunciation? (viz. a rapid succession of *e* after *a?*) is *novissima* to be understood adverbially? isn't it rather obvious, no matter how we understand it? The artificial and theoretical character of Terentius' elucidation is well evidenced by his faint and indefinite reference to *-ai* and *-ae* transition in Greek, evidently second- or third-hand information. Why go so far afield for a parallel, if diphthongal utterance of *ae* was the actual practice of his time? "sed magis in illis (i.e. in the *μεταπλάσμοι*), *e novissima sonat et propterea antiqui quoque Graecorum hanc syllabam (i.e. ai) per ae scripsisse dicuntur.*" What shall we do with *propterea?* This indeed seems to throw some light on this curious passage. "E," he says, "sounds," i.e. is audible, "more," than what? than *A?* then the corollary with *propterea* is senseless: there remains nothing else than to take *I* as the standard of comparison: in *ai* the actual audible *auslaut* resembles an *e* more than an *I*, hence the change of *ai* to *ae*: i.e. therefore some ancient Greeks ("antiqui Graecorum" is to say the least an odd piece of Latinity: perhaps antiqui quoque quidam) wrote *AE* instead of what? instead of the normal *AI?* I am convinced that the traditional reading and the orthoepical inferences from Terentius Scaurus must be radically recast. Lindsay (*Latin Language*, p. 38) bases his thesis of diphthongal pronunciation on this passage. And so, too, Bennett (*Latin Grammar*, Appendix, p. 8, 9). The Greek parallel really occurred in a very limited era: i.e. in the dialect of Tanagra as over against Plataea, Thebes, Orchomenos, Thespieae, cf. Meister, *Die Griechischen Dialekte*, Göttingen, 1882, vol. I. p. 238, otherwise older *ai* passed into *η*. Blass in his *Ausprache des Griechischen*, transl. by Purton, 1890, p. 67, is also one of those who from Ter. Scaurus maintain a late pure diphthong *ae*, because it would help indirectly to support his general theme of the late development of *ä* in Greek.

On Priscian's naive way of putting it (I. 53), viz. that Latin modified [*ai* to *ae* and] *oi* to *oe* "ad imitationem Boeotorum," I need not speak. My own conclusion is that in the Augustan era *ae* was a fair equivalent to *ä* or *η*, as Lucian Müller says (*Orthographiae et Prosodiae Latinae Summarium*, St. Petersburg, p. 17), "*ae sonabat ut η Graecorum.*" I append a note with which I was favored by Professor

Franz Bücheler of Bonn (Feb. 13, '98), "die Aussprache von *ae* wie in deutsch 'eile' halte ich für ganz verkehrt, für richtig dagegen die bei uns übliche Aussprache wie in deutsch 'bär' welches in manchen deutschen Gegenden (Sachsen z.B.) ganz ê artig, also wie 'bêr' gesprochen wird, ähnlich die lat. Doppel- oder Vulgärformen wie *muraena Murena, praetor pretor* u. s. w. Das *â-i* eines Lucrez oder Vergil ist für deren Zeit durchaus künstlich, aus der ältesten Zeit und der Ennianischen Technik repetirter Archaismus, gerade so künstlich fortgepflanzt wie bei unsern deutschen Dichtern um des Reims oder Klangs willen: 'er fliegt' oder 'ihr güldenes Haar' u. dergl. nach meiner meinung also sind *scaena* u. *scena* in der class. Aussprache wenig verschieden, nicht mehr als d. *nähren* und wie Luther schrieb *neeren*."

Remarks were made by Professor Warren and the author.

24. Roman Business Life as seen in Horace, by Dr. Charles Knapp, of Barnard College.

The author's aim was to show what information can be derived from the pages of Horace concerning Roman Business Life as it existed in his day. (The examination whose results were embodied in this paper is part of an investigation of the whole subject of Roman trade and commerce, on which the author has been for many years engaged.)

The first point made was the fact that on almost every page of Horace we have evidence that the intense commercial activity of his times had made a deep and lasting impression on his imagination. By way of proof of this statement, cf. for the present (1) the constant recurrence of the *mercator*, the merchant engaged in transmarine commerce. He is mentioned or referred to in eleven passages. (2) Passages like *Epp.* i. 1. 53 ff., i. 1. 62 ff., i. 6. 31 ff., *Sat.* i. 1. passim, testify to the ascendancy of the spirit of commercialism. (3) Commercial metaphors bear testimony to the same condition. Cf. the well-developed figure in *C.* i. 3. 1-8, where Vergil is spoken of as a *depositum*, and the ship as a sort of bank messenger charged with the duty of delivering Vergil, like so much money, safely on Grecian soil. Something of the same figure appears in *C.* i. 24. 11-12, *Tu frustra pius heu non ita creditum Poscis Quintilium deos*.

The growth of Roman commerce, especially in the last two centuries B.C., was due largely to two causes, (a) the wants of the people, and (b) the increase of luxury. On both these points some light is thrown by Horace. (1) The wants of the people in their relation to commerce. The needs of the greater portion of Rome's population of a million or more (see Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.*³, ii. 120 ff., Friedländer, *Sittengesch.*⁶, i. 58 ff., Lanciani, *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, 93) were indeed small. For the slaves' *demensum* see Cato, *De Agri Cultura*, 56-58. The free poor probably on the average required but little more. In the diet of the latter, bread (*frumentum*) and vegetables (*holus*) played the chief part. For *holus* in Horace as a simple diet, cf. *S.* i. 6. 111 ff., *C.* i. 31. 15-16, where the olives, the chicory, and the mallows are typical of the humble life of the contented poor, *S.* ii. 7. 30 ff., etc. Yet, after all, vast quantities of supplies, especially grain, were of necessity imported yearly to satisfy the wants of Rome's people. Grain came e.g. from Africa (*C.* i. 1. 9, iii. 16. 30-32,

S. ii. 3. 87) and Sardinia (C. i. 31. 3-4). Some grain, of course, was raised in Italy; cf. C. iii. 16. 22 ff. Among the necessities of life, even to the poor, were olives, olive oil, and honey. Olives Italy raised in abundance, in fact in such quantities as to have some for export. The best came from Venafrum (see *e.g.* C. ii. 6. 16). Honey came in part from Italy, in part from abroad (cf. C. ii. 6. 14 and S. ii. 2. 15 for honey from Hymettus, C. iii. 16. 32 and iv. 2. 27 for Calabrian and Matinian honey).

(2) The spread of luxury as contributory to the development of commerce. In C. ii. 18 Horace condemns ostentation and praises *aurea mediocritas*. In vss. 1-8 we have a pen picture of one of Rome's gorgeous palaces. The columns were cut in farthest Africa, the roof-beams came from the slopes of Hymettus, the *lacunaria* are adorned with ivory and gold, both foreign products, the clients wear Spartan purple. In a word, the corners of the earth have been ransacked to fit out this mansion. Horace refers also to Phrygian and to Parian marble. For the purple of Tyre or Sidon cf. S. ii. 4. 84, *Epp.* i. 10. 25, for robes dipped in Gaetulian purple *Epp.* ii. 2. 181, for purple from Cos C. iv. 13. 13. The epithets applied to perfumes, too, are significant. Thus we have Assyrian nard, Syrian *malobathrum*, and Achaemenian perfumes. Two names of perfumes, *malobathrum* and *balanus*, are themselves importations. Suggestive, too, are the items in the bill of fare given in *Epod.* ii. 49 ff. Other viands mentioned by Horace as found on Roman tables are oysters from Circeii, the *peloris* from the Lucrine Lake, the *murex* from Baiae, the *pecten* from Tarentum, the *piscis Iberi*, the *echinus* from Misenum, pickled fish from Byzantium, saffron from Corycus in Cilicia for dressing, boars from Umbria, Laurentum, and Lucania, vinegar made from wine of Methymna, pears from Calabria, apples from Picenum and from Tibur, etc. Cf., too, the names of wines, Falernum, Massicum, Chium, Lesbium, Coum, etc.; all speak of commerce, whether inland or transmarine.

The impression created by these allusions, of the existence of a vast volume of commercial dealings energetically carried on with remote and widely sundered regions, is strengthened by the mention of *Thyna merx*, of *Cypriae mercs*, of Cyprian ships, of iron from Spain and Noricum, of horses from Gaul, of wool from Tarentum and Gallia Cisalpina, of fleeces dyed at Aquinum, of cloaks woven at Miletus, of *Campana suppellex*, etc.

The chief sources of wealth in Horace's day were (1) transmarine commerce; (2) agriculture; (3) the rearing of cattle, horses, sheep, etc.; (4) banking operations, including the farming of the revenues. The first three of these are often mentioned by Horace, singly or in combination; cf. C. i. 31. 1-15, ii. 16. 33 ff., ii. 3. 17, ii. 6. 10-12, iii. 16. 25-32, iii. 23. 5-8, *Epod.* i. 23 ff., etc. To banking there are but few allusions; cf. however, S. ii. 3. 69-71, i. 2. 14-19, i. 3. 85-87, ii. 3. 18, *Epp.* i. 1. 54. To the *publicani* there are no references, naturally enough; they flourished in the provinces; Horace's life was spent in Rome and Italy. To the contract system, which was highly developed among the Romans, slight allusions are made by Horace; cf. C. ii. 18. 16-17, C. iii. 1. 34-37, *Epp.* i. 1. 77 and ii. 2. 72.

Some material was then presented to show what light Horace throws on the details of business operations as conducted by the Romans. Horace here tells us far less than *e.g.* Martial. He has more to say of the book trade, perhaps, than of any other form of business. The tricks of Roman trade also are to some

extent illuminated by Horace, especially by *Epp.* i. 16. 57 ff. Besides, we have cheating tavern-keepers, dishonest business partners, and counterfeit Sidonian dyes (*Epp.* i. 10. 26-29).

Before proceeding to draw inferences from the facts presented in his paper, the author called attention (1) to the fact that the various allusions in Horace which can be pressed into service by the student of Roman business life are incidental in character. Of course nothing was further from Horace's thoughts than the project of contributing to a knowledge of this subject. He was perhaps always himself unconscious of the extent to which his imagination had been stirred by the abounding mercantile life by which he was surrounded. (2) Horace speaks with perfect knowledge of the things he mentions. He has seen and touched them, every one. In other words, we are not dealing in Horace with literary reminiscences, but with the facts of contemporary life.

The inferences from the facts brought out in this paper are: (1) More information than is commonly suspected can be drawn from our texts in relation to Roman trade and commerce. (2) The statements sometimes made to the effect that commerce played but a small part in the economy of Roman life are not true. Had commerce played but a small part in Roman life it would never have stamped itself so largely on the picture of that life as drawn by Horace. (3) The part played by commerce in Horace's verses goes to show clearly that the higher classes had no real antipathy to trade. Passages like Cicero *De Off.* i. §§ 150, 151, Livy xxi. 63. 3, and Pliny, *Epp.* i. 3. 3, do not reflect the real heart of the Romans on this question. Horace was the court poet, a very marvel of tact, writing for the cultured few (*S.* i. 10. 64-91). If those few in their secret souls had really entertained a disgust for trade and commerce, Horace, the man who declared his appeal to be to their judgment and to theirs alone, would never have suffered a thing distasteful to them to occupy so large a place in his verses.

Remarks were made by Professor Sihler and by Dr. Knapp.

25. Notes on Eur. *Alc.* 501, Soph. *Ant.* 450-452, and *O. C.* 1036, Thuc. 7. 13, 2, by Professor Mortimer Lamson Earle, of Bryn Mawr College.

Of these notes only the first two were presented in full, the other two being briefly mentioned. In the first note the reading *παισιν* was defended against the conjecture *παῖσιν*, which has been made independently by several scholars. In the second note the reading *ὁ τοῦς* (Erfurdt) was deduced and defended in Soph. *Ant.* 452. It is the writer's intention to publish these notes, as well as the two others, elsewhere in full.

Professor T. D. Seymour then presented the following Report of the Committee of Twelve for 1897-1898:

To the American Philological Association,—

The Preliminary Report of the Philological Association's Committee of Twelve was printed not only in the Proceedings of the Association but also in the organ of the National Educational Association, and in other educational journals. In

addition, copies of a special edition of 2000 were sent to the most prominent local educational organizations of the country, especially to commissions engaged in securing a closer articulation of the work of schools and colleges, to associations of classical teachers, and to associations of teachers of high schools and college preparatory schools, with the request for criticisms and suggestions. The replies which were received to the Committee's invitations and inquiries indicated that the Committee with its auxiliaries, on the basis of the information which it had secured as to the means and wishes of the schools, had prepared schemes for courses of study which with slight modifications would give as general satisfaction as any such schemes could give. We are well aware that what is suited to the wants of a large school in one part of our great country may not be exactly adapted to the needs of a small school in the midst of different surroundings. The teacher is far more important than the method.

For the further consideration of the proposed courses of study in Latin and Greek for secondary schools, your Committee of Twelve with its auxiliaries met in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on April 1 and 2, 1898. In connection with this meeting of your Committee, and under its auspices, a Classical Conference was held, which was attended by several hundred teachers from more than half of the states of our Union, at which twenty-seven papers were presented, chiefly philological, of interest and value. Never before had so many philologists gathered at any meeting west of the Alleghenies.

Prior to the meeting of the Committee of Twelve, on March 31, the Latin Subcommittee held two long sessions, in conference with the Latin Auxiliary Committee.

On April 2, the Committee of Twelve unanimously adopted a plan for a four-year course, two five-year courses, and one six-year course in Latin, and a three-year course in Greek, and appointed sub-committees to edit these courses with justifications on paedagogic grounds of the recommendations which are made.

The Committee of the National Educational Association, at whose request your Committee of Twelve was directed to undertake the work of preparing these courses of study, desires that our final report be made to the National Educational Association, and be first published by that body; and since your Committee was not instructed to prepare these courses for your information or approval, we presume that you will not object to our acceding to this desire. Since this final report cannot be made until 1899, we ask for the further continuance of this Committee for one year, but that we may be excused from a further formal report to this Association.

Respectfully submitted,

T. D. SEYMOUR,
Chairman.

The report was accepted and the Committee continued.

26. Complementary and Supplementary Defining Parataxis, by Dr. George Dwight Kellogg, of Yale University.

One of the most important advances in syntactical method has recently appeared in the *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XVIII., in Morris's treatment from the formal side of the subjunctive in independent sentences in Plautus.

The chief contribution is to be found in his analysis and construction of a formal method based on a critical examination and collection of the data, and fruitful in its applications.

In approaching the subjunctive from the formal side, we must, in making our categories, depend upon indications of the meaning and use supplied by the context itself, and avoid translation, interpretation, and analogies. The careful analysis of the context of a given subjunctive form (e.g. Morris, *A. J. P.* XVIII. p. 276) will show the operation of two kinds of limiting and defining forces, which, for convenience, I will call *implicit* and *explicit*. Morris's first class would be implicit, because involved in the subjunctive form itself independent of the adjoining context. These forces, whose very remarkable influence he has pointed out in pp. 277-282, are person, number, tense, and voice (which I would call forces, resulting from the *inflexional* form), and, lastly, the proper meaning of the verb-stem (*lexical* or *semantic* form). This last force, touched upon slightly by writers during the last quarter-century, described by Morris, pp. 282-7, offers a fruitful field for investigation. The more numerous *explicit* forces are to be sought in the "particular setting" of the subjunctive form. Besides those enumerated by Morris (the kind of sentence (interrogatory, etc.); presence of limiting particles; negation; relation to the preceding thought; voice inflection and gesture; and paratactic definition) may be mentioned: the collocation of the words in the sentence; relation to the following thought; contextual paraphrase; synonymization; conscious variation in expression; influence of the kind of composition (comedy, epistolography, oratory); sentence-accent; the writer's known mental habit and peculiarities, etc.

But it is of paratactic definition or defining parataxis that I wish particularly to speak.¹

Taking such forms as *volo veniat* or *fac mittas* for example, Morris outlines his theory on pp. 292-301. "An examination of a few of these cases of which full lists have been given, will make it entirely clear that what is called the leading verb syntactically is not the leading thought, but an addition, an insertion into a sentence already formed. The germ of the sentence is the subjunctive verb; to it almost all the modifying words—subject, object, adverbs—belong, and the sentence would be intelligible, though not equally precise, without the indicative verb. In many cases sentences very similar or even absolutely identical occur without the added verb. With the few exceptions spoken of above—and I think it could be shown that these are not really exceptions—all cases of paratactic subjunctive in Plautus are of this kind. . . . The added paratactic verbs . . . both repeat and amplify. The idea which is taken up from the subjunctive verb and repeated may appear in the form of the added verb (*sine, fac, vide*, etc.), or in its *meaning* (*volo, obsecro*), or both (*velim, malim, vellem*) . . . Repetition, however, is not the function of these added verbs; it is only the condition which makes their close union with the subjunctive possible. Their function is to define, to bring out more clearly the particular kind of will or desire which is expressed too vaguely in the mode, or to express with precision

¹ In addition to the literature on Parataxis given by Morris, *l.c.*, p. 299, may be added J. Lattmann, *Progr. Clausthal*, 1879, p. 22 ff., with references; H. Neumann, *De futuri in priscorum Latinorum vulgari vel cotidiano sermone vi et usu*, pp. 8. 14, 20-23, 32, etc.; Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, Venersborg, 1892, pp. 82-90.

something in the relations of the persons involved which the subjunctive merely suggests."

I have quoted somewhat fully in order to give at the outset the gist of the theory of defining parataxis as formulated by Professor E. P. Morris, of New Haven. For convenience of reference, the subjunctive defined by parataxis will be termed the "paratactic" *par excellence*; the verb used to define this subjunctive, the "definitive." Thus in *velim mihi scribas*, *scribas* is the paratactic; *velim*, the definitive. The purpose of the present paper is to subject this construction to fuller analysis, to point out some essential differences between the personal and impersonal definitives, and to emphasize again the part played by defining parataxis in the *sermo cotidianus* in the development of subjunctive idioms.

My examples will be taken mostly from the Ciceronian correspondence, which presents the largest number of cases. If we include definitives, which are themselves independent subjunctives (*velim*, *vellem*, *cuperem*, etc.), we have, out of 1953 cases of the independent subjunctive, about 1235 which are associated in defining parataxis. These figures do not include cases with *ne* where hypotaxis is possible, nor forms in *-am* unless defined. In Plautus there are about forty different definitives occurring 317 times with the subjunctive out of a total of 1603 cases of the independent subjunctive (Morris, p. 293). In the Letters (and unless otherwise specified the epistles of Caelius, Plancus et al. are included), there are some forty-six different definitives (only about twenty-five of which occur in Plautus) occurring 596 times in a total of 1953 cases. Professor Morris has not given complete lists for *credo*, *obsecro*, etc. (cf. p. 294), but these may be supplemented largely from Lindskog, *Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos Latinos*, Lundae, 1896, pp. 7-24, and Tessing, pp. 86-7.

The following list for the Letters will give an idea of the range and variety of definition: age, cave, crede, fac, vide, admoneo, amabo, censeo, curo, dabo operam, hortor, mando, obsecro, obtestans, opinor, oro, peto, quaeso, remitto, rogo, petimus, quaesumus, rogamus, dabis operam, rogas, edicere, volo, malo, vis, velim, pervelim, nolim, vellem, mallem, nollem, cuperem, caveant, licet, licebit, necesse est, oportet, oportebit, opus est, opus erat, commodum non erat, putat oportuisse.

Others in Plautus: facito, facite, iube, sine, cedo, da, date, mane, nil interdicto, faxo, faciam, faxim, si exoptem, censen, (quid) vis, vin, credin, potin, optimumst, decretumst, certumst, decet, and a few others.

These definitives divide into two classes:—

I. Personal definitives.

(a) imperatives.

(b) indicative *volo* forms.

(c) subjunctive *volo* forms; also a few cases like *cuperem*, *caveant*.

(d) a class of verbs often less closely paratactically definitive, but containing expressions of will modified into the form of advice (*admoneo*, *censeo*), request (*amabo*, *oro*, *rogo*, *peto*, etc.), urgent proposal, entreaty, etc. These definitives are not always used in the same meaning in different contexts, and in the same context we may have combinations such as *oro et obsecro obtestans*, *rogo atque oro*. The degree of emotion is often graded by *plane*, *valde*, etc., or in the case of imperatives by *modo*, *utique*, and the like. With this type of definitive the approximation to *oratio obliqua* is often very close, especially in the later Latinity.

II. Impersonal.

(a) *licet, decet*, denoting the absence of restraining necessity.

(b) *necesse est, oportet*, etc., denoting the presence of constraining necessity.

With negation (b) may approximate to (a).

I. COMPLEMENTARY DEFINING PARATAXIS.

When we analyze the phrase *velim scribas* we see that it is a request. Written alone, the word *scribas* might convey various notions: the spoken word by the inflection and emphasis of the voice and gesture could receive its exact shade of meaning. *Velim* defines the expression as a request bordering on optation, which is modified and restricted by the lexical form (*scribas* = *dicas* in epistolary style). *Velim* reinforces the modal meaning, being itself very much like *cupio*, as may be inferred from the following synonymization in Cic. *ad Att.* XIII. 13. 1: Tu autem mihi *pervelim scribas* qui intellexeris illum velle; illud vero utique *scire cupio* . . . id hercle restabat! sed tamen *scire pervelim*.

Rogo, obsecro, censeo, etc., while reinforcing the modal meaning of the paratactic, less strikingly, it is true, than the subjunctive *velim*, present to the hearer the effect of the expression as a whole.

The imperatives and *volo-velim* forms seem to perform their definitive functions analytically: *rogo, obsecro*, etc., to do so synthetically. The former emphasize the modal meaning: the latter, the quality of expression.

Professor Morris, on p. 300, tentatively calls the general class of defining parataxis "defining or complementary parataxis." As one name is better than two, and "defining parataxis" exactly conveys the idea, it is better to reserve the term *complementary* for the particular variety just treated—that is, all cases where the definitive has *personal* form. Thus we can apply to the remaining definitives of impersonal form the term *supplementary*. These terms are better than "personal" and "impersonal." The latter describe the form: the former, the function. Defining parataxis, then, describes the general function of this variety of the construction known as parataxis, whereas complementary and supplementary may be given to the special applications.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY DEFINING PARATAXIS.

The impersonal definitives are of two classes:—

(a) *Licet, licebit, decet*, signifying permission, concession, etc., i.e. restraining necessity, at the vanishing point. When *licet* is with the subjunctive the modal idea is allowed free play so far as the implicit forces permit. Powers outside of the speaker, hearer, actor, and willer are recognized, such as moral, civil, and religious law, convention, custom, force of circumstances, etc., all of which are felt to exercise influence over the mind of the subject. A disposition or desire to act is premised on the part of the subject, as well as uncertainty as to the possibility or expediency of action. The speaker, by his very assurances, adds the personal motive for action. *Non licet, deducet*, etc., denoting the presence of restraining necessity, if they do not form a distinct class, at least serve as a transition to the next.

(b) *Necesse est, oportet*, etc., refer to the existence of a constraining necessity. Action is declared to be a personal obligation or an unavoidable necessity. The same extra-personal forces may constrain as restrain. Ignorance of the existence of such impelling forces, or unwillingness or irresolution may be, but are not necessarily, presupposed in the subject. When the subject is the first person, the effect is that of deliberation or self-consultation. Some forms of the supplementary definitive are more restricted. *Optimumst* denotes the constraining moral obligation to act for the best. *Certumst mihi* and *decertumst mihi* are quite different from *cerno* and *decerno*. The impersonal form indicates a fixed resolution, the obligation to fulfil which is accepted by the subject.

The impersonal definitives, therefore, are supplementary. We have the subjunctive with such modified modal meaning as inflexional and lexical form, together with all the explicit forces (barring parataxis) may give; we have from the fact of statement and paratactic definition a reinforcement of the mode by the speaker's assurance, advice, warning, etc.; in addition we have extra-personal motives expressed which may be said to be supplementary.

A concrete illustration of this distinction may be of help.

Cic. *ad Fam.* XIII. 71: Multos tibi *commendem necesse est*, quoniam omnibus nota vestra necessitudo est tua erga me benevolentia: sed tamen etsi omnium causa quos commendo, *velle debeo*, tamen cum omnibus non eadem mihi causa est. Without resorting to English translation, we may observe that by Cicero's *a fortiori* argument, *commendem necesse est* is stronger than *commendare velle debeo* (cf. Cic. *ad Brut.* I. 8. 1).

Enough attention has not yet been given to the analysis of adverbial expressions which occur with subjunctives. Not infrequently with an aparatactic subjunctive they have the effect of complement or supplement; they may also alter the effect of a complementary to that of a supplementary definitive.

One formal peculiarity of the supplementary definitive is striking. In the great majority of cases which I have observed in Plautus and Cicero it stands in strict post-position to the subjunctive, sometimes disjunctive post-position, rarely in pre-position. On the other hand, the great majority of complementary definitives are in pre-position.

Licet is interesting from the fact that it early became specialized to protasis-functions. One of the ways to detect this usage when the absence of *tamen* or an unmistakable apodosis leaves uncertainty is to observe its position. In pre-position it tended to become a concessive particle. In the Letters the distinction is for the most part true. In Martial, who has a partiality for *licet* as a concessive particle, out of fifty-four cases, twenty-seven are in pre-position; of those in post-position, fourteen are with forms of *esse*.¹

Necesse est occurs twenty-five times in the Letters as definitive, twenty-two times in strict post-position, three times in strict pre-position (two of the cases being in Pollio *ap. ad Fam.* X. 33. 1, and in Caecina *ap. ad Fam.* VI. 7. 3, both in syntactically dependent relative clauses. Cf. also *ad Fam.* X. 29).

Oportet occurs in the Letters once in strict pre-position with the first singular, five times in strict, once in disjunctive post-position with the second singular. *Oportebit*, once in disjunctive, once in strict post-position. With the third singu-

¹ Emory B. Lease, "Concessive Particles in Martial," *Class. Rev.*, February, 1898, p. 30.

lar Cicero uses *oportet* once in strict post-position, Pseud. Brutus (*ep. ad B. I. 16*) uses it twice in strict pre-position.

In general, omitting dependent verbs with *licet*, of about fifty cases of supplementary definitives in the Letters, all are in post-position except two in letters by Cicero, two in the spurious *Ep. Bruti ad Cic. I. 16*, and one each in Pollio and Caecina in relative clauses.

Of the 534 cases of complementary definition, 419 are *volo* forms, 114 miscellaneous. About twenty per cent of the former and a little less than fifteen per cent of the latter are in post-position. *Fac, vellem, mallem, and nollem* are always pre-positive; *cave* is post-positive only once.

A great many interesting facts may be brought out by such analysis. For instance, the paratactic definitive may from the point of view of the hearer pass from strict definition to motive: *censeo facias* approximates to *velim facias, nam censeo*; so we have "*velim facias*" answered by "*faciam, ut censes*," which gives to the whole phrase *velim facias* the notion of advice, and tends to show that *velim* defines analytically, reinforcing the mode; while *censeo* in *censeo facias*, stamping the expression as advice, defines synthetically.

Again, the motive, purpose, and result are closely allied, so that *ut*-constructions develop. It is a striking fact that in the Letters *volo* is not used with *ut*; *malo* once; *velim* only a very few times, for the most in contexts containing verbs usually construed with *ut*; *vellem* only once, with *id*; *mallem* once.

It is also striking that out of some 560 cases of the non-interrogative independent subjunctive in the second singular, present tense, less than a dozen occur *undefined* by parataxis, and the text in some of these cases is not certain. This remarkable state of things must have been due largely to the conventionalities of letter-writing. Without the aid of voice, inflection and emphasis, gesture, and the other accompaniments of the spoken word, a bare aparatactic subjunctive form of the second person might lead to a misunderstanding through overstatement or understatement. The definitive thus compensates for the loss of voice and gesture.

Paratactic definition precludes the so-called "general second person," which the epistolary style itself tends to avoid. In the case of the general second person, the distinction between command and request fails.

The problems suggested by the third person are numerous. It manifests a marked fondness for the passive voice, the indefinite subject, and indirect commands. Obliquity has crept in very early through the synthetic definitives, which were more loosely in parataxis.

In the first singular, if we omit instances with *utinam*, etc., phrases like *moriar si*, and doubtful *-am* forms, the only non-interrogative, aparatactic use in the Letters is with *velim*-forms, and a few cases of hypothesis.

The first plural is generally aparatactic. The position of the verb in the clause (most often near the beginning), the formation of idioms, notably in abrupt resumptive phrases, and the presence of certain particles, tend to give the sentence definite modal effect. I am inclined to believe that the notion of obligation and propriety so often associated with the subjunctive, itself is in reality produced on the mind by explicit forces of the context: paratactic definitives, the adversative articulating particles, the pre-position of the verb in the clause, and so on.

27. On Comparisons from Painting and Sculpture in Aristotle and Dionysios, by Dr. Mitchell Carroll, of Johns Hopkins University.

Since the appearance of Lessing's *Laocoön*, in the popular criticism of poetry and sculpture and painting, much has been written about the limitations, the ultimate likenesses and differences of the various arts. In such discussions Aristotle has been frequently appealed to, as for instance by Lessing. But comparatively little attention has been paid to other Greek aesthetic critics. Yet the brilliant antithesis of Simonides (τὴν μὲν ζωγραφίαν ποίησιν σωπῶσαν . . . τὴν δὲ ποίησιν ζωγραφίαν ἀλάουσαν, Plut. de Glor. Ath. 421 γ); the tradition that Apelles and Protogenes in their lost works on painting determined the laws of painting by the already established laws of poetry; and the fact that the rhetoricians continually cite illustrations from painting and sculpture in their literary criticism, are indications of the richness and fulness of the material for a study of the relations of the arts from the point of view of antique aesthetics.

The writer, in the paper of which this is a brief abstract, considered the comparisons with painting and sculpture in Aristotle and Dionysios of Halikarnassos in order to ascertain what points of likeness in the three arts lead to comparisons. He argued that Aristotle in developing a theory of poetry, by the nature of his citations of painting, really developed in many points a theory of painting as well; strange to say he refers to sculpture only in general terms.

Thus all three arts are treated as modes of imitation: in discussing the objects of imitation he laid down the fundamental distinctions between three schools of poetry and painting — idealistic, realistic, caricaturistic. The representations cited of the first are Homer and Polygnotos; of the second Kleophon and Dionysios; of the third Pauson in painting, Hegemon, Nikochares and comic poetry in general. Plot in poetry is compared with drawing in painting as being the soul, the essential element. "The most beautiful colors laid on confusedly will not give as much pleasure as the chalk outline of a portrait," etc. *Êthos* holds the second place in both. Homer and Sophokles and Polygnotos are the ideal representatives of *êthos*. Yet just as there can be tragedy without *êthos*, there can be painting without *êthos*. Euripides and Zeuxis are artists who, while entirely lacking in *êthos*, yet exhibit an idealism of technique. Furthermore, Aristotle asserts for both arts the purely aesthetic standard: "it is a less fault not to know that a doe has no horns than to paint one badly."

Oratory was regarded by the ancients as a fine art; hence the rhetoricians frequently draw comparisons from the fields of painting and sculpture. For example, Dionysios in (I.) Characterizations of Style compares (*a*) Isokrates and Lysias to schools of sculpture, the former to the art of Polykleitos and Pheidias in its impressiveness and sublimity and dignity, the latter to that of Kalamis and Kallimachos in its lightness and grace. In contrasting Isaïos and Lysias he draws his comparisons from the field of painting: Lysias is likened to a correct and careful draughtsman such as Polygnotos; Isaïos to a subtle chiaroscuroist or colorist like Zeuxis.

In treating the (II.) Acquisition of Style, Dionysios concludes that excellence in literary expression is to be acquired in the same way as excellence in sculpture and painting, viz., by a careful study of models. To stimulate the students of literary art to study the productions of the great masters, he tells the story of

Zeuxis, who in painting his picture of Helen for the temple of Hera had the five most beautiful maidens of Kroton as models; and he compares the painful efforts of Plato and Demosthenes to painters and sculptors who exhaust the refinements of their art "on the veins, on the feathers, on the down of the lip and the like niceties."

On all three arts Dionysios finds as the (III.) Criterion of Style, a cultivated instinct (*ἄλογος αἰσθησις*). The critical sense must be trained, by long and devoted study and application, until it become a cultivated instinct.

This paper will appear in full in the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

Adjourned shortly after 10 P.M.

THURSDAY MORNING.

HARTFORD, July 7, 1898.

The meeting was called to order at 9.45 A.M.

28. On the Versification of the Latin Epigraphic Senarii,¹ by Professor Arthur Winfred Hodgman, of Ohio State University.

This investigation is based on 695 senarii, or fragments of senarii, chiefly epigraphs, now collected in Bücheler's *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Leipzig, 1895, 1897. It is natural to compare the inscriptional senarii with literary verse (especially that of Plautus and Terence), and Oscar Brugman has already done this in his monograph on coincidence in senarii, Bonn, 1874. Now, though 106 of our verses antedate 44 B.C., it is doubtful if any are contemporary with Plautus or Terence. Still, the evidence of the inscriptions is not to be disregarded in considering the versification of the early comedy; positive confirming evidence is certainly to be accepted, and that of any other kind held in reserve.

It has been convenient to establish roughly several chronological sets of inscriptions: Class I. antedates 44 B.C.; II. extends to Trajan, and III. from Trajan on.

1) *Even feet*.—Those inscriptions that are long enough to indicate whether the composer was consciously following strict rules for the even arses or not, show that the free sort of verse continued to be written throughout the whole period covered by our collection, and that it is oftener represented than the strict. There was, however, an increasing tendency to write verses with the even arses pure. The strict verses occur in these percentages: of class I. 16.67, of class II. 33.93, of class III. 40.00, of all, 32.67. This growing tendency to adopt Greek usage appears, also, in numerous other points, and in verses in various other metres, as well as in the late adoption of the rarer metres.

In the free verses Meyer's Dipodic Law holds 74 times, and is neglected 23. One or two of the cases of neglect may conceivably be explained away by sup-

¹ This paper was an abstract of a portion of an account of the *Versification in Latin Metrical Inscriptions, except Saturnians and Dactyls*, which will appear in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. ix.

posing that *éventū* stood originally for the actual *évenidū*, or by scanning *cēciderūnt* with a short penult. It may be noted that to Cicero

missos faciunt patronos ipsi prodeant

made a good senarius (*Orator*, 222).

2) *Resolutions* occur frequently, and in just the same way as in comedy. The ordinary rules for the placing of the resolution are, however, occasionally broken, so that we get such accentuations as *itū neque*, *pid fuit*, *card mieis*, *ossā dedi*, *Vernd Kufria*, *castā fide*, *antē quidem*, *Iventid Hilara* (and this in the 5th foot!), *Tertia*, *Iulia*, *Hercūles*, *imminet*, *omnia*, *ambūla*, *pocūli*, *Diarrýtos*, *innūis*, *spar-tēam ut*, *itūque*, *nimia*, *Stéphāne*. Seventeen of these 21 are in the 1st foot, exactly where such accentuations occur in Plautus and Terence. Arses are irregularly treated in *dēpressērē vēnēficāe*, *fiāt hōnōratus*, *Sōspitā pia*, *nūmīnis infernae*. Several places like these may be treated by synizesis, e.g. *Iūlia*, *dēbuit*. The irregularities result from the introduction of unwieldy proper names, or are instances of 1st foot license, or occur in inscriptions otherwise metrically poor.

3) *Fifth foot*. — This is spondaic in 476 verses, iambic in 73, and of some other form in 64. An iambus in the 5th foot is admitted by Luchs and by Klotz only under fixed rules. These rules cover 60 of our 73 iambs. Those that remain seem innocent enough, and eight are in inscriptions that are distinctly good. Three verse-ends not strictly cretic are practically so (e.g. *placere nōn quēdm*), hence unobjectionable. Most offensive, according to Luchs, is an ending consisting of a cretic word followed by a dissyllable; we find four of this form, with two others that are practically the same. Luchs also points out that two iambic words should not end a senarius; two of our verses have such a close. No new rule can be deduced from 13 miscellaneous instances, but we should not forget that Luchs had to cut and emend before he could make his rules hold.

4) *Iambic shortening*. — With the exception of iambi in the 6th foot, of words like *bene* and *nisi*, and of words that are usually treated by synizesis, — words naturally iambic become pyrrhics in 37 instances, remain iambs in 56, suffer elision in 18, and are divided between two feet in 3. A syllable long by position is shortened by a preceding short in 10 cases; a vowel long by nature is irregularly shortened in 4 polysyllables.

Iambic shortening was resorted to less and less as time went on. It was used in later times, not as a process consciously understood, but rather in a limited number of common words which had been permanently affected by the early tendency, such as *ego*, *tibi*, *modo*. Of the 37 natural iambs that become pyrrhic, 20 come from the *mihi-ibi* class, and 5 are the pronoun *ego*. The words in the *mihi-ibi* class are used as pyrrhics 20 times, in the 6th foot 24 times, as iambs 8 times, i.e. they are iambs only on a metrical pinch.

5) *Length by position*. — A syllable containing a short vowel followed by a mute and a liquid (or by *fr*), remains short in 27 cases, is indeterminate in 19, and is lengthened in 7. Of these 7, one, *pat-rono*, is early, between Sulla and Caesar. The others, *pat-ris*, *pat-ri*, *pat-re*, *Ag-rippae*, *sac-ra*, *ref-reno*, are late.

6) *Miscellaneous, quantity*. — Once we get an *-ius* genitive, *ullius*, and once *sērō* (in iambic Graecanici). In one verse we find *id illi*, about A.D. 50. Bücheler takes this as evidence that even then *ille* was pronounced with a short penult.

But the distich that affords this one instance looks suspiciously like a stock epitaph derived from an earlier time; in fact, we have it all but exactly reproduced in two other inscriptions.

7) *Hiatus*.—We find 9 instances of hiatus in good inscriptions (7 at the semi-quinaria caesura, 1 due to a proper name, 1 due to change of number) and 28 instances in fair or poor inscriptions (17 at the main caesura [14 at the semi-quinaria, 1 at the semiseptenaria, 1 at 2d foot diaeresis, 1 at 3d foot diaeresis], and 11 at other parts of the verse). Of all 37 instances, then, 24 are at the main caesura, and, of these 24, 7 are from excellent inscriptions. We recall the 240 Plautine instances, listed by Spengel, of hiatus at the penthemimeral caesura, and we begin to wonder if those 240 or our 24 can be due to chance, or whether hiatus at a pause or main caesura was not permitted in the senarius. If it was legitimate, its absence from most of the comic senarii would mean nothing, but its presence in a respectable number would be significant. Some of our verses, though occurring with others that are faulty, have themselves no metrical flaw save the supposed one of hiatus. One may, like Bücheler, propose to transpose, or to substitute other words for those on the stones; but it seems very curious that if these cases of hiatus were due to transpositions or substitutions, so large a part of them—24 out of 37—should fall exactly at the metrical pause, 21 of them at the penthemimeral caesura. Hiatus in class I. occurs at the rate of 2.83 instances to a hundred verses; in the later classes, at the rate of 5.77, and in the senarii as a whole at the rate of 5.32. If we compare our cases of hiatus with those of Plautus, we must of course bear in mind the difference in time, but we cannot afford to neglect the evidence of the stones. It is in agreement with the notions that prevailed at the time when the arguments to the plays of Plautus were written; and it is so strong as at least to make it worth while for some one again to look into Spengel's long list.

It is interesting to find instances of the non-elision of monosyllables (semi-hiatus, trochaic shortening), one coming as late as A.D. 126. We get *cū āmeiceis*, *tām īnuom*, *iām āliquid*, *dē āpotheca*, and possibly *mē āmasti*.

8) Elision of long vowels and diphthongs occurs in class I. at the rate of 35.84 times in a hundred verses, in the later classes at the rate of 15.95, and in all at that of 18.99. This remarkable decrease is in general agreement with the fact that stricter verse gained ground, proportionately, in later times.

9) Synzesis occurs regularly enough in words like *meus*, *tuus*, and cases of *is* and of *idem*. The more noticeable instances are in long proper names, such as *Veldumnianus*, *Lucilianum*. *Periit* occupies the 6th foot in two independent inscriptions. *Aliud* doubtless points to an actual pronunciation *alid*. *Diarrytos* is often in late inscriptions spelled with a Z.

Eius, twice, and *quoius*, three times, appear as monosyllables. These upset the theory that genitive forms *ei* and *quoi* may be put into the text of Plautus where the manuscripts give the usual genitive forms which must be scanned as monosyllables.

10) *Syncope*.—We find *Hercules*, *pocūli*, and *ambūla* cut for what was possibly pronounced *Herclēs*, *pocli*, *ambld*.

In the famous epitaph of the "sightly dame" Claudia, *alium* is used for *alterum*, evidently to avoid the syncopated *altrum*. On this Bücheler remarks "*par huic exemplum haud facile inveneris apud antiquos*." A late parallel occurs in Arg. Plaut. *Capt.* v. 2, apparently for the same reason as here.

11) *Verse-end.*—Two hundred and twenty-two senarii end with a cretic word, 295 with a dissyllabic word, 13 with a monosyllable, and 89 with words of other lengths. Twelve of the monosyllables are forms of *sum*, and the other is *me*, in *dnte mé*, so that all these are practically cretic endings. The form of the verse-end bears of course on the matter of coincidence, which, among other topics relating to the senarii, must here be omitted.

The senarii as a whole follow very closely the rules established for the versification of Plautus and Terence. The most striking departure, if it is a departure, is the freedom with which hiatus is allowed at the main caesura of the verse. Departures from the usages of literary verse we should expect to find, for our inscriptions are mainly sepulchral, and are often tinkered from archetypes; it is remarkable that they show so few irregularities. Occasionally the aberrations seem to point to words pronounced differently from those actually cut on the stones. The results afforded are perhaps all that could be expected from so small a number of verses (hardly more than the senarii of one comedy), of which only about one-seventh antedate the empire. The later verses show, in various details, an increasing tendency to write more nearly on Greek models.

Remarks were made by Professors Gudeman and Warren, and in reply by the author.

The Committee on Officers for 1898-99 reported through Professor Lodge the following recommendations:—

President, Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University.

Vice-Presidents, Abby Leach, Vassar College.

Samuel Ball Platner, Western Reserve University.

Secretary and Treasurer, Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College.

Executive Committee, The above-named officers, and

Francis A. March, Lafayette College.

Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University.

Tracy Peck, Yale University.

Andrew F. West, Princeton University.

John H. Wright, Harvard University.

The report was adopted and the above officers elected.

The Committee on Time and Place of Meeting in 1899 reported, through Professor Sihler, in favor of holding the next annual meeting at New York University, University Heights, beginning Wednesday, July 5, 1899. Adopted.

The Committee to audit the Treasurer's accounts reported, through Professor Elwell, that it had examined the accounts of the Treasurer, compared them with the vouchers, and found them correct.

A discussion on the plan of holding a General Congress of Philologists, similar to that held in 1894, resulted in a vote to empower the Executive Committee to decide whether it is advisable for the Association to join in such a general session.

Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College, reported as Chairman of the Committee on Spelling Reform.

The Committee has not been called on for any official action since the last meeting of the Association. It reports progress. The Chairman invites attention to a discussion of the fitness of the rule for fonetic spelling of preterits in *ed* for an entering wedge.

29. Note on the Classical Anemone, by Professor L. H. Elwell, of Amherst College.

The identification of the classical anemone with the cistus has been assumed by Canon Ellacombe on the basis of a passage in Ovid. The writer endeavored to show that this view could not be accepted as against explicit statements by Pliny, Dioscorides, and Theophrastus.

Remarks were made by Professor D'Ooge and by the author.

30. The Orthography of English Preterits, by Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College.

This paper appears in full in the *TRANSACTIONS*.

31. Language-rivalry and Speech-differentiation in the case of Race-mixture, by Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan (read by Professor M. L. D'Ooge).

This paper is printed in full in the *TRANSACTIONS*.

Professor J. H. Wright then proposed the following vote of thanks, which was adopted by a rising vote : —

Voted, That the American Philological Association extend its most cordial thanks to the President and Corporation of Trinity College for their hospitality in opening the buildings of the college to the Association for its thirtieth annual session; to President Smith and Mrs. Smith in receiving the members at their house on Wednesday afternoon, July 7; and to Professor Hart and the Local Committee for their unfailing thoughtfulness and kindness in providing for the comfort and convenience of the Association during the session.

32. New Words in Thucydides, by Dr. John D. Wolcott, of the Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.

This paper appears in full in the *TRANSACTIONS*.

33. Iphigenia in Euripides and Racine, by Professor W. S. Scarborough, of Wilberforce University (read by title).

In viewing the character presented by these two poets, similar scenes are to be compared most closely. The first meeting between father and child, the shock

of surprise which comes to Iphigenia upon learning her destined fate, and the announcement of her final resolve to resign herself to it — these afford the basis of proper comparison.

Euripides in the first depicts a happy, care-free, dependent child, unburdened by affairs of state — one whose questions indicate not only ignorance of existing conditions, but the most childish curiosity concerning them, one upon whom the sense of a father's uneasiness is forced because so very apparent (633-676).

ὦ μήτηρ, ὑποδραμοῦσά σ', ὀργισθῆς δὲ μή,
πρὸς στέρνα πατρὸς στέρνα τάμὰ περιβαλῶ.
ἐγὼ δὲ βούλομαι τὰ σὰ στέρν', ὦ πάτερ, etc.

Racine introduces her as a more mature, more dignified maiden (Act ii. Sc. ii: 531-536, sq.), keenly observant of her father's uneasiness, seeking to divine the motive (Act ii. Sc. ii: 554, 559), and filled with filial love and pride, for example:

Vous vous cachez, Seigneur, et semblez soupirer;
Tous vos regards sur moi ne tombent qu'avec peine.
Avons-nous sans votre ordre abandonné Mycène?

In Euripides she next meets Agamemnon as a frightened, pleading child, weak and terrified (1211); actions in perfect keeping with the character he introduces, evincing none of the "stout-heartedness" (*εὐθυχῆα*) so strenuously asserted by some to be the cardinal virtue of Grecian women. In Racine the meeting between the two finds her self-poised, giving but a startled exclamation, "Mon père — Ciel!" (Act iii. Sc. v: 914, 922); then she gathers herself up, more Dorian in type than in the Greek characterization, forgetting herself in defending her father for the part he plays (993-998, 1001 sq.). When in Euripides she declares her determination to die, it is with abruptness and seeming inconsistency when we consider her so recent lament for life; yet the inconsistency is that of the very child he draws (1368), borne up and carried on by her ideas concerning Fate and a sort of swiftly reached, Joan-of-Arc exaltation, sustained by the easy surrender to her resolve which Achilles makes, because no true love fills his heart for her. Racine leads her more gradually to this determination, no less firm, unchanged by a lover's pleading, but sustained by a more womanly idea of the effect of her death upon the future of those she holds most dear — father and lover.

Euripides' character is a child, dependent upon her mother Clytemnestra, who suggests, directs, and manages almost entirely the whole affair, influenced by Agamemnon, her father, who to the last "will or nill" must make the sacrifice, and by a lover who does not seriously combat her determination to become a martyr.

Racine's Iphigenia is a more stately self-poised conception, presenting a more complete woman in the unfolding. This is aided both by the creation of a rival, Eriphile, who develops her generosity, and by a father whose resolve at last to save her, however weakly put forth, gives other root for higher heroism than fanatic exaltation. There is a more independent existence apart from the mother, and a higher motive in the resignation which turns from the clinging resolution of a passionate lover to support a father in whom she trusts. It is true that Racine lets us see more of Iphigenia, but we are to judge from what is placed before us, not from what is concealed. Imagination is capable of conjuring up

almost any idea as to what may have had lodgment in the mind of the heroine in the absence of words or acts in support of any theory.

A religious tragedy in both cases; in one the religion is full of pagan characteristics, while the other savors throughout of Christian sentiment. In one, the least religious of Greek poets has portrayed female character — a poet who, like all the Attic tragedians of his time as De Quincey declares, knew little about such character in truth because of a lack of opportunity to study it; in the other, the picture is drawn by one whose Port Royal training crops out wherever the theme is religious — by one who had plenty of opportunity to know woman. We conclude that the finer qualities reside in the heroine of the French poet. It is the truly heroic, generous, tender, modest woman we admire, more than the naïve, impetuous, piqued child-martyr of Euripides.

34. Certain Functions of the Locative, by Professor Henry F. Linscott, of the University of North Carolina (read by title).

A characteristic feature of the case-system of Latin is the syncretism of the Locative and Ablative-Instrumental. In consequence the functions of the Locative are, in general, supplied by the form of the Ablative. It seems clear, however, that this instance of syncretism was a later development than that of the Ablative and Instrumental. For that reason, perhaps, the former is somewhat less complete. Proof of this fact is seen in the retention of the Locative form of the first and second declensions.

But the syncretism of the Locative and Ablative-Instrumental is not less complete in this respect alone. It is true, further, that all the functions of the Locative have not been merged in the Ablative. For a study of those Indo-European languages which have preserved a formal distinction between the cases indicates that the former case had certain forces which are not readily discernible among the uses of the Ablative so-called of Latin. This force of the Locative is that which seems to have, as a primary value, the idea of *limit* or *direction*. The case was so used with verbs of motion to denote the *limit* or direction of the verbal action.¹

This use of the Locative may be seen in the following examples: —

pāyo gōsu dādadhā śadadhīsu, *R. V. X. 73, 9.*

‘Thou didst place milk in the cows and sap in the plants.’

Sā no bhāgāya vāyāve vipravīrah sadāvṛdhah sōmo devēsu ā yamat, *R. V. IX. 44, 5.*

‘May Soma, praised by inspired singers, full of vigor, incline our song toward the gods, for Bhaga and Vayu.’

śānā mahām indram ydsmin viçvā ā kṛṣṭāyaḥ somapdḥ kāman dvyan, *R. V. III. 49, 1.*

‘I praise mighty Indra, to whom all soma-drinking people give affection.’

¹ Whitney, *Skt. Gram.* 2, § 304; Delbrück, *Grundriss*, III., p. 225, 227 ff.; Micklosich, *Gram. d. Slav. Spr.* IV. 640 ff.

dgne yām yajñam adhvaram viçvdaḥ paribhār āsi sa id devēṣu gacchati, R. V. I. 1, 4.

‘Whatsoever offering and sacrifice thou dost encompass, Agni, that surely goes to the gods.’ Cf. also *R. V. IV. 23, 5*; *VIII. 2, 39*; *X. 42, 6*; *X. 43, 2*.

It is also true that this use of the Locative is not found with verbs of motion alone. The case is, also, used to indicate the *limit* or *direction* of a thought, purpose, desire, or aptitude. This construction takes a wide range in Sanskrit, and is well illustrated by the citations of Whitney.¹ Reference to this use of the Locative is also made by Delbrück.²

It is evident that these functions of the Locative do not appear as a considerable and important category among the recognized uses of the Ablative. Possibly there are certain retentions of this usage by the latter case: indeed, it is hoped that such constructions may be discussed in a later paper. Yet these must be isolated instances, and the fact still remains apparent that our construction does not form so important a category in the Ablative of Latin as in the Locative of the parent language.

It is necessary, therefore, to seek a different disposition of these Locative functions in the adjustment of the case-system of the Latin; or, in other words, to indicate another case with which they may have been syncretised.

There seems to be a high degree of probability that these forces of the Locative were merged in the Dative case of Latin, and for the following reasons:—

I. Similarity of Function.

Evidently these constructions of the Locative would be in contact with certain characteristic uses of the Dative. The primary forces of the two cases are, of course, far removed. Yet, the derived or extended uses seem to approach closely and to coincide. As the indirect object of a verbal action, the Dative was often used to indicate the person or thing upon which influence is exerted by the action or by the existence of qualities. Hence the Dative may express the limit or direction of an action, thought, purpose, or aptitude. In this phase of meaning the Dative is in close contact with those functions of the Locative to which reference has been made. This similarity of force is illustrated by the following examples of Locative constructions:—

prā yé vāsuhya īvad ā nāmo dūr yé mitré vdruṇe sūktadvācaḥ, R. V. V. 49, 5.

‘Who offered such devotion to the Vasus, singing praises to Mitra and Varuna.’

yau te çvānau yama rakṣitārau caturakṣāu . . . tābhyām enam pāri dehi, R. V. X. 14, 11.

‘Give this one, Yama, to those dogs which are thy protectors, four-eyed, etc.’

yās te çṛṅgavṛṣho napāt prānapāt kuṇḍapāyayā ny āsmin dadhra ā mānaḥ, R. V. VIII. 17, 13.

‘The Kundapayyah, who is thy great-grandson, O grandson of Cringavriṣh, upon him is thy interest directed.’ Cf. also *R. V. II. 2, 11*; *I. 10, 6*.

¹ Whitney, *Skt. Gram.*², § 303 a.

² Delbrück, *Grundriss*, III., p. 227 f.

II. Analogy of other languages.

Greater probability is added to the hypothesis by the history of the Dative and Locative cases in other languages. In Greek, Germanic, and Celtic the two cases have been united by syncretism. These facts support the supposition that a part of the Locative functions have been merged in the Dative of Latin.

There are also certain evidences discernible among the Italic languages. The form of the Dative of the *i* and consonant declensions of Oscan-Umbrian are Locative in origin. It is also true that the *i* of Latin may be from the same source.¹ This circumstance seems to point to the assumption that there was a relation more or less close between the two cases.

These considerations seem to support the hypothesis that the syncretism of the Locative and Ablative-Instrumental was not complete as has been assumed. There is no considerable body of constructions of the Ablative which may be compared with the Locative functions noted. It seems to be, therefore, probable that these uses of that case have been merged with the Dative of Latin.

35. Note on *Antigone*, vv. 904-912, by John L. Margrander, Esq., Rochester, N.Y. (read by title).

In attempting a new solution of this famous problem, I shall direct my investigation principally to verses 904 and 908. They are the pivotal points of the argument, and any defence of the passage as a whole will stand or fall, as we do, or do not, apprehend their meaning.

The current conception of v. 904 is open to a number of objections. In the present position of the adverb, the affinity of *εἰ* for *τοῖς φρονούσιν* cannot be violated, in spite of *O. C.* 642. A double leap in the thought, due to a false antithesis (*τοιάδε: εἰ*) and the immediate resumption of *τὸ σὸν δέμας πισιστέλλονσα* (903) by *σ' ἐτίμησα*, produces an impression of incoherence with v. 903. The resulting argument is most unskilfully constructed, and ends with an irrelevant conclusion (*ἐτίμησα εἰ: ἐκπροτιμήσασα*), unless we admit a pun on the word *νόμος* (*νόμου* 904, a physical law: *νόμῳ* 913, a moral law). The thought is objectionable: vv. 905-908 can have no part in an argument that Antigone did right to honor her brother; such an argument could not be based on the circumstance of vv. 911-912; the whole defence in vv. 904-912 contradicts her previous character. Under such circumstances it is a fair question whether the passage or the interpretation deserves impeachment.

The play itself suggests the method by which this passage should be approached. Verses 924, 929-930, and 943, all later than the suspected lines, show that Antigone's sentiment has undergone no change (cf. vv. 73-77, 450-460, 511). Hence vv. 904-912 should be examined in the light of previous passages wherein public opinion is referred to. Both in scenes I. and IV. Antigone refused to submit her conduct to a human tribunal, and maintained that she obeyed divine law. The version *σ' ἐτίμησα εἰ*, 'I honored thee rightly,' is therefore excluded. Wherever the judgment of men is noticed, it is to another purpose. In vv. 84-87, 502-505, and 692-699 Antigone's deed is spoken of 1) as a *glorious* one, and 2) one *justifiable* in the brother's case; for the latter is what the pathetic expressions *ἀδελφόν* (46), *τὸν αὐτάδελφον* (503), *τὸν αὐτῆς αὐτάδελφον* (696) imply. In any later

¹ Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II., p. 603.

reference to public opinion we may look for this twofold judgment. V. 904 promises such a reference for the following lines. Only, in an apostrophe to Polyneices, Antigone will emphasize the greatness of the honor done him rather than the glory falling to herself. The climax of *νῦν δέ* (902) and the less aptness in an apostrophe of a mere defence bear us out. Now let v. 904 speak for itself.

V. 904 is antithetic to vv. 902-903. As *τοιῷδε* there is the emphatic word, and represents a verb or verbal noun (*θανατοῦσθαι, θάνατον*), *ἐτίμησα* must be stressed in v. 904. To bring out the primary stress of *ἐτίμησα*, we must emphasize it above *ἐγώ*, which is likewise emphatic. This intensified stress and the circumstance that simple *ἐτίμησα* would fall below the expectation raised by *καῶτον καίτοι*, and *ἐγώ*, force, a pregnancy on *ἐτίμησα*: 'I honored thee,' i.e. 'I honored thee in the full sense of the word, with a signal honor' (cf. I Cor. vii. 23, *τιμῆς ἡγοράσθητε*). This pregnancy can be established from the verses following. V. 913 resumes both 904 and 908, and is thus partially parallel with 904. V. 913 replaces *ἐτίμησα* (904) by *ἐκπροτιμήσασα*, and assumes the notion of signal honoring as already existent. For *τοιῷδε νόμφ*, resuming *τινος νόμου* (908), there has the main stress, and vv. 909-912 merely contain the law. The comparative element in *ἐκπροτιμήσασα* must therefore have been established before v. 908, in vv. 904-907. But vv. 905-907 are merely exegetical. The notion of signal honoring must therefore exist in v. 904, and *ἐτίμησα* is pregnant. We are then to render 'I honored thee in the sight of the wise,' and not 'I honored thee *rightly* in the sight of the wise.'

There is a pronounced gain for the interpretation. Formerly Antigone's statement was not in harmony with her previous character. She had before scorned to save herself by a falsehood (cf. 9-19, 441-448), and would not stoop to sophistry now. If she was serious, she either renounced the principle on which her conduct was grounded, or no adequate psychological motive could be alleged for her temporary change of front. This motive our interpretation supplies. In extolling the honor shown Polyneices, Antigone was interested in magnifying it as much as possible, and her passionate nature might easily lead her to say more than she meant at heart. So in vv. 86-87 we are no more to suppose that Ismene would really be more hateful on account of her silence than that Antigone really would not have buried a husband or child, had occasion arisen.

If vv. 904-907 show how *signally* Antigone honored her brother, vv. 908-912 will establish the second point and demonstrate that the act was justified for the brother. The difficulty is again with the first line, v. 908. *Ταῦτα* (908) is usually taken as the direct object of *λέγω*. It must then be referred to vv. 905-907; for these verses, like v. 908, are prepared by, and subordinate to, v. 904. If we now refer *λέγω* to the law, there is a false thought; if the content of vv. 905-907, the reasoning suffers. In either case, there is no logical connection with v. 904; hence "the tone of clumsy triumph, strongly suggestive of the interpreter who bespeaks attention for his coming point" (Jebb). These difficulties are obviated by referring *ταῦτα* (908) to *σ' ἐτίμησα* (904) as defined by vv. 905-907. *Ταῦτα* is then equivalent to *ταῦτα δρᾶσαι* (cf. vv. 211-212, and 538-539) and a part of the phrase *τινος . . . χάριν*, the whole phrase being the object of *λέγω*. This view of *ταῦτα* is borne out by vv. 913-914, where *ταῦτα*, resuming *σ' ἐτίμησα*, is itself taken up by *σ' ἐκπροτιμήσασα*. The effect on the sense is most happy. V. 908 at once becomes spiritualized: not the law, but justification through the law is set in relief.

But the effect goes deeper. If the writer of vv. 908-912 did not merely wish "to call attention to his coming point," a superficial view of vv. 909-912 may not be the one intended. Assailants of the passage direct their attack chiefly here, and point out that the transfer of the argument of the wife of Intaphernes from the living to the dead involved an absurdity that no great poet could have overlooked. The very absurdity shows their view to be a mistaken one, and the context confirms this opinion. V. 908 called for a law; v. 913 refers to one. VV. 909-912, taken literally, express none. But they suggest one, namely, that the tie binding an orphaned brother and sister ranks the marital or parental tie. Such metonymic use of vv. 909-912 is not unworthy of Sophocles.

A few minor objections may be briefly met. Wecklein's emendation of v. 905, endorsed by Weil, would seem to be unnecessary. *καθ'ανόντος* (909) and *τοῦδε* (910) are good Greek, and due to considerations of brevity. Schneidewin's objection to *ἀπ' ἄλλου φωτός* (910) has been met by Weil ("Il convient, en effet, de supposer une mère privée de son mari; autrement, ce dernier aurait dû défendre le corps de l'enfant"). Jebb's simple equation (*οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις = οὐδείς*) has closed debate on v. 912. *βίᾳ πολιτῶν* (907) has proved to be a *crux*. The annotators all assume that Antigone's opinion as to Theban sympathy has undergone a change. But there is no reason for assuming that Antigone uses the expression otherwise than had Ismene (79). Now the latter had only learned of the edict from Antigone (10-19), and so knew nothing of the mood of the citizens. *βίᾳ πολιτῶν* is thus quite synonymous with *νόμον βίᾳ* (59), *ἀπόρρητον πόλει* (44), *Κρέοντος ἀντειρηκόςτος* (47), a meaning more suited to a purely rhetorical passage. *ἐτήκετο* (906) I take as an imperfect of past likelihood and danger.

We may now gather our result in a translation of the passage. I render as follows: —

'However, I *honored* thee in the sight of those that have understanding — honored thee with signal honor. For had I been a mother of children, or had a husband lain exposed to corruption, I should nevermore have defied the state and taken on me this toil.

'Doth any one ask in deference to what law I claim to have done this — preferred thee so in honor? (*The tie that bound sister and brother was the more sacred tie*:). I might have had another husband in lieu of him departed, and child from another, had I surrendered up this; but when father and mother are hidden with Hades, no brother ever could spring up again.'

Those who condemn our passage have perhaps made too much of the fact that it is an adaptation from Herodotus. Adaptation *per se* is no sign of spuriousness; with other evidence it may become cumulative. We may with equal right use the circumstance of adaptation for defending the opposite view. Historic record implies the right of appeal to it for precedents. The only proviso is that the poet can be shown to have made apt use of the borrowed material. This Sophocles seems to have done. In two respects he has even improved on his source. For Antigone, the child of Oedipus and Iocaste, the proposition that the paternal tie was closer than the marital or fraternal, was absolutely true. If she committed a fallacy, it is one closely connected with the essential fallacy of the play. Again, the hypotheses of vv. 905-906 fitted Creon exactly.

The argument for the authenticity of our passage derives considerable support from an investigation of its structure and relation to the whole play. Antigone's

points, briefly reviewed in scene I, are more fully stated in the scene with Creon. She here asserts that she obeyed the laws of the gods ; that Creon's folly prevented him from seeing this ; that the Thebans applauded her deed ; likewise the dead. We have here a fourfold appeal, arranged as an anticlimax with reference to the authority and disinterestedness of those appealed to. The same fourfold appeal recurs in vv. 897-928, but arranged as a climax for rhetorical reasons. The symmetry of the plan is reflected in the form ; for vv. 891-928 consist of a six-line introduction and four sections of eight lines each. The division apparently fails at v. 904. But this verse is modulatory, and might easily be extruded into the first section because of the mass of meaning to be crowded into the next eight lines (905-912). The whole passage (891-928) thus seems to be well articulated itself and organically connected with the play as a whole, important considerations in a question of the genuineness of any part.

The authority of Aristotle should have greater weight than the wish of Goethe, whose view was a derived one (cf. his article, *Den Philologen Empfohlen*, under *Deutsche Literatur*). It may not be possible positively to commit Aristotle to the view here advanced ; but there is this to be noted in favor of assuming essential agreement. The thought is, in the two cases, the same. Secondly, it were psychologically more probable for our passage to suggest itself to Aristotle's mind as an illustration of the point he was making, if the thought in question constituted the principal line of argument (as in the present interpretation), than if it were merely incidental (as in the current conception).

The President then declared the session adjourned.

The thirty-first annual session will be held at New York University, University Heights, N.Y., beginning Wednesday, July 5, 1899.

INDEX.

Arabic numerals indicate the pages of the *Transactions*; Roman numerals indicate the pages of the *Proceedings*.

- Accent-substitution, 43.
 Admetus, character of, 65 ff., 82 ff.
 Agricola's invasion of Ireland, xxxvi.
 Alcestis' legend in Hesiodic epic, 66-68.
 America, the future language of, 35, 46.
 Anemone, the classical, lviii.
 Anglo-Saxon weak preterits, 97.
 Aristotle's comparisons from painting and sculpture, liii.
 Aristotle's Homeric criticism, xxi.
 Aristophanes' *Acharn.* 666, xiii.
 Army terms, 32 ff.
 Article, in Greek omitted in prose, 49;
 with proper names, 49 ff.; with def.
 numbers, 52 ff.; exceptions, 54 ff.;
 with rel. clauses, 49, 56; in exclama-
 tion, 49, 62, 63; with *τις*, 49, 62.
 Article, anaphoric with proper names,
 in Greek, 49.
 Article, omitted with substantives after
 οὗτος, *ὅδε*, *ἐκεῖνος*, 48-64.
ἀταραξία, xi.
 Bacchylides, mute and liquid in, 86 ff.
 Birt, xii.
 Calpurnius Piso's villa at Herculaneum,
 ix.
 Celtic conquest of Germans, 32.
 Celtic speech, changes in, 41.
 Chalcidian alphabet, xxxvi.
 Chinook jargon, 31.
 Cicero, *Cato Maior*, 28, 34, v.
 Climate, effect of, on speech, 39, 45.
 Corson, H., spelling of English preterits,
 102.
 Dice, Achilles and Ajax at, xxvii.
 Differentiation of Germanic speech, 44,
 47.
 Differentiation of Indo-European
 speech, 39 ff.
 Differentiation of Romance speech, 40.
 Diogenes Laertius X., x ff.
 Dionysius' comparisons from painting
 and sculpture, liii.
 English preterits, orthography of, 97-
 103.
 English speech, changes in, 41.
 Epicurus, *Epistola ad Herodotum*, xi;
 Epistola ad Pythoclem, xi; *ἡ γνήσιος*
 φυσιολογία, x; *περὶ μετεώρων*, x; *περὶ*
 φύσεως, 37 bb., ix; *τὸ κανονικόν*, ix;
 φθαρτοὶ κόσμοι, x.
 Etymologies, etc.: Skr. *ádhi*, 26; *dhí-*
 yam-dhâ, 29; *nirṇeka*, 9. *ἀγαθός*, 30;
 ἀθερίζω, 27; *ἀμφορεύς*, 19; *δῶ*, 'house,'
 6; *ἐνθα*, *ἐνθεν*, 26; *μαννοφόρος*, 25;
 δμπη, *δμπνη*, 22. Lat. *am-* 'ambi-'
 17; *ambrices*, 18; *am-icio*, 17; *an-*
 fractus, 19; *com-bre-tum*, 18; *-do*
 (postpositive), 6, 10; *dōnec*, etc., 7 ff.;
 endo, *indu*, 7: *eō*, 'thither,' 7; *im-*
 brices, *v. ambrices*; *in-*, 'ambi-,' 18;
 inde, 26; *in-ferus*, 27; *lumbus*, 14;
 mamphur, 25; *mandare*, 27; *ollae*
 'manes,' 23; *pando*, 6; (di)patellarii,
 23; *quō*, whither, 7; *tendo*, 6; *timen-*
 du, *timidus*, 10; *secundus*, 5; *sed-um*,
 8. Osc. *amfret*, 17; *Ἄμπος*, 'Ancus,'
 21; *Anafriss*, 19; *diumpais*, 21; *ínim*,
 26; *liganakdíkei*, 22; *Maatús*, 22;
 manafum, 27; *patanai*, 22; *uila*, 24.
 Samnite Allifae, 29, 30; Callifae, 29,
 30. Umbr. *ambretuto*, 17; *anferener*,
 25; *arnipo*, 9, 10; *en(n)om*, 26; *ne-*
 pitu, 9, 10; *ninctu*, 16; *umen*, 16.
 Fr. *mandrin*, 25.
 Euripides' *Alcestis*, dependence on He-
 siod, 68; on Phrynicus, 69; purpose
 of play, 65, 66, 80-85; Herakles, 74-
 78.
 Euripides' Iphigeneia, lviii.
 Euripides, punning allusions to, in Aris-
 toph., xiii.
 Franks, language of, in France, 33.
 Furnivall, F. J., spelling of English
 preterits, 102.
 Germanic conquest of England, 33.

- Germanic conquest of Finns, 33.
 Germanic conquest of Slavs, 33.
 Germanic speech, differentiation of, 44, 47.
 Giro, archaeological, xix.
 Government terms, 32 ff.
 Hadley-Allen, 48.
 Hare, J. C., spelling of English preterits, 100, 101.
 Herakles in Euripides' *Alcestis*, 74-78.
 Herodotus, 1. 1, 78e, 57.
 Hirt's theory as to the differentiation of Indo-European speech, 39 ff.
 Horace, Roman business life as seen in, xlv.
 Horace, 1 *Sat.* 5, 97, ix.
 Hyperbaton, 55, 62, 63.
 Immigrants, language of, 35.
 Indo-European speech, differentiation of, 39 ff.
 Iphigenia in Euripides and Racine, lviii.
 Juvenal, literary relationship to Martial, xxviii.
 Kühner on Greek article, 52.
 Language-rivalry, 31 ff.
 Latin *ai* and *ae*, xl.
 Latin epigraphic senarii, liv.
 Latin genit. in -i, xxv.
 Latin: the letter Z in Early Latin, xxxiv.
 Locative, certain functions of, lx.
 Lowell, J. R., spelling of English preterits, 102, 103.
 Lucian, *Timon*, 18, vii.
 Lucretius V.-VI., ix.
 Lucretius, and Epicurus *περὶ μετεώρων*, ix.
 Lysias, vii, 10, 52.
 Martial and Juvenal, xxviii.
 Milton, spelling of English preterits, 99.
 Mute and Liquid in Bacchylides, 86 ff.
 Mythology: Ceres and her worship, 21; Dea Dia and her worship, 23; Osc. Kerri 'Cereri,' 21; Umbr. Praestote Sèrhe, 24.
 Normans, language of, in England, 33.
 Orthography of English weak preterits and participles, history of, in A.S. and Wiclifite Bible, 97, 98; Spenser and Milton, 98, 99; Tennyson, Lowell, 101-103; amendment of, J. C. Hare, 100, 101; F. J. Furnivall, 102; H. Corson, 102.
 Ovid, date of his banishment, xxxii.
 Parataxis in Latin, xlvii.
 Philodemus the Epicurean, xi, xii.
 Phocis, alphabet of, xxxiii.
 Phonetic changes, etc.: Greek aspirates in Oscan, 19; Osc. *f* transcribed by *φ*, 19; Ital. -*nd-* from -MN-, 5; -*nd-* from -NDH-, 16, 26; -*nd-* from -NY-, 5; -*nd-* from -TN-, 5; -*nf-* from -NDH-, 15.
 Phrynichus' *Alcestis*, 66, 69, 74; length of, 75; analysis of, 78.
 Plato *Rep.*, 549 B (ὅς ὁ 'Αδ.), 50.
 Plautus, Greek words in, xiv.
πίσις, xiii.
 Praxilla skolon, 79.
 Proper names, article with, in Greek, 49.
 Race-mixture, 31 ff.
 Rhodian inscript. (C. I. G. 3. 1260), xxxiv.
 Roman conquests, 34.
 Romance speech, differentiation of, 40 ff.
 Sanskrit, disguising in Skt. plays, xviii.
 Seminar, philological, xix.
 Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VI. 20. 5, xii.
 Senarii, epigraphic, in Latin, liv.
 Smith, C. F., on Greek article, 64.
 Sophocles' *Antig.* 904 ff., lxii.
 Sound-substitution, 37 ff., 44.
 Speech-differentiation, 31 ff.
 Speech-mixture, 31.
 Spenser, spelling of English preterits, 98, 99.
 Suffixes, etc.: -adhyāi, Skt. infin. suffix, 12; -εσθαι, Gk. infin. suffix, 12; -endae, Lat. infin. suffix, 13; -do- suffix from DHĒ, 14; -do- suffix from DŌ, 10; -dhē, Skt. infin. suffix, 12; -dhā in Skt. compounds, 13.
 Syntax of Skt. infinitives, 11.
 Syntax of Latin gerundive, 11.
 Tacitus, *Agricola*, xxxvi.
 Tacitus, *Annals*, iv. 12, vi.
 Thucydides: i. 1. 2 αὐτῇ, 58, 64; i. 51. 2 εἶναι, 48; i. 51. 4 αὐται, 55; i. 58. 2 ταύτην, 53; i. 85. 1 ταύτας, 56.
 Thucydides, new words in, 104-157. ἀγανάκτησις, 134; ἀγωνισίς, 125; ἀγωνισμός, 138; ἀκροβολισμός, 139; ἀλλοτρίωσις, 139; ἀνάκλησις, 135; ἀνάκρουσις, 116, 120, 136; ἀνακχή, 117, 132, 135; ἀναλογισμός, 139; ἀνανώσις, 130; ἀνδραποδισμός, 125, 132; ἀνίσωσις, 132; ἀνοιξις, 129, 138; ἀνολεκή, 132; ἀντεξόρμησις, 122; ἀντιλαβή, 139; ἀντιμίμησις, 127; ἀντιπαρσκευή, 122; ἀντίταξις, 132, 138; ἀντιτείχισμα, 118; ἀντιτέχνησις, 138; ἀντιφυλακή, 139; ἀπαγγελία, 128; ἀπαρίθμησις, 132; ἀπόβασις, 116, 121, 122, 124, 130, 138; ἀπόγνοια, 139; ἀποδοχή, 127; ἀποκινδύνεωσις, 135; ἀποκομιδή, 129, 138; ἀπόνοια, 140; ἀποστέρησις, 139; ἀποτείχισμα, 117; ἀποφυγή, 120; ἀψωσις, 131; ἀττικισμός, 121, 123; αὐτομολία, 126; αἴχη

σις, 121, 135; βεβαίωσις, 139, 140; γεωργία, 125, 140; γνώσις, 130; γυνώσις, 136; δάνεισμα, 138; δήλωσις, 128, 129, 135, 138, 139; διαγνώμη, 121, 138; διακελευσμός, 139; διακονία, 124; διάκοσμος, 139; διαμαρτία, 138; διαμέλλησις, 138; διάπλους, 117, 119; διαπολέμησις, 117; διαπομπή, 139; διάφεισις, 138; διαφύγη, 118; διαχείρισις, 132; δικαίωσις, 120, 122, 126, 129, 133; διοίκησις, 137; δούλωσις, 120, 130; ἐγκατάλλησις, 118; ἐγχείρησις, 125; ἐκβλήθαι, 138; ἐκδρομή, 118; ἐκπεμψις, 138; ἐναντίωμα, 139; ἐναντίωσις, 136; ἐνεργίς, 133; ἐνθυμία, 123; ἐνοίκησις, 122; ἐξέτασις, 133, 138, 139; ἐξήγησις, 138; ἐπαγωγή, 128, 131; ἐπαναγωγή, 131, 138; ἐπανάσεισις, 128; ἐπαναχώρησις, 138; ἐπεκδρομή, 138; ἐπέκπλους, 138; ἐπεξαγωγή, 126; ἐπεξέτασις, 138; ἐπέξοδος, 138; ἐπεργασία, 130; ἐπιβοήθεια, 139; ἐπιβόημα, 123; ἐπιβούλευμα, 119, 122; ἐπιδοχή, 139; ἐπιθειασμός, 125; ἐπικέλυσσις, 139; ἐπικλυσσις, 138; ἐπικράτησις, 130; ἐπίλειψις, 138; ἐπιμαρτυρία, 140; ἐπιμαχία, 119; ἐπιμονή, 118; ἐπίπεμψις, 131; ἐπίπλευσις, 120; ἐπίπλους, 120, 121, 123, 125, 126, 136, 137, 138; ἐπιτείχισις, 117, 124, 133; ἐπιτειχισμός, 123, 126, 135; ἐπιτέχνησις, 126; ἐπιτίμησις, 136; ἐσθήγησις, 129; ἐσκομδή, 128; ἔσπλους, 128; ἔσπραξις, 131; ἐστίσεις, 123; ἐφόρμησις, 117, 121, 132, 139; ἔφορος, 123, 129, 138; ζήλωσις, 133; θανάτωσις, 125; ἱκετεία, 127, 138; ἱππομαχία, 139; κάθειξις, 132; κακοπραγία, 126, 136, 137; καταβολή, 125, 129, 131; κατάγνωσις, 131; καταδολῶσις, 131, 135; καταδρομή, 117, 126, 138; κατακομδή, 139; κατάμεμψις, 134, 139; κατάπλους, 122, 140; κάταρσις, 136; κατάφεισις, 138, 139; καταφρόνημα, 126; καταφρόνησις, 125, 132, 133, 138; κατοίκησις, 123; κατοίκισις, 130, 133; κλήσις, 121, 133; κόλασις, 130; κοίφισις, 139; κουφολογία, 137; κύκλωσις, 123, 128, 130, 136; κύρωσις, 139; κωλύμη, 124, 126, 132; λαχανισμός, 123; ληστεία, 125, 138, 140; λώφησις, 127; μέλλησις, 119, 123, 126, 131, 135, 136, 139; μετάθεσις, 118; μετὰμελος, 120, 135; μετοί-

κησις, 123; μήνυμα, 122, 123, 125; μισθοδοσία, 124; νεωτεροποιία, 137; νόμισις, 125; ξενηλασία, 126; ξένισις, 138; ξυγκομδή, 119, 139; ξύλληψις, 138; ξύλωσις, 137; ξυμβοήθεια, 118; ξυμμέτρησις, 140; ξύμπτωμα, 124; ξυν-οίκισις, 121; ξύνταξις, 138; οἰκείωσις, 138; οἰκοδόμησις, 126, 128; οἰκοδομία, 139; ὀλόφουρσις, 129, 138; ὀμηρεία, 124; παιανισμός, 118; παράγγελσις, 118; παράδοσις, 130, 138; παραίρεσις, 128; παρακέλυσσις, 124, 138; παρακελευσμός, 139; παρακινδύνεσις, 138; παράκλησις, 130, 135; παρακομδή, 124, 128; παράλογος, 119, 120, 130, 137; παρανόμημα, 119; παράπλους, 124, 137; παράταξις, 124; πάροδος, 116, 124, 126; παροίκησις, 139; παροχή, 133; πείρασις, 121; περικοπή, 129, 139; περικύκλωσις, 121; περιτείχισις, 118, 121, 122, 128, 131; περιτείχισμα, 117; περιτειχισμός, 120, 123, 126; περιτέχνησις, 133; πλάνησις, 139; πρέσβευσις, 138; προάγγελσις, 129; προαναχώρησις, 136; προεκφόβησις, 124; προενόκησις, 131; προκατηγορία, 139; πρόσψις, 132, 135, 139; προσδοκία, 122, 127, 134, 135; προσκοπή, 132; πρόσμυξις, 125; προσδρομίσις, 126; προσποίησις, 121, 128; πρόσταξις, 138; πρόσχωσις, 119, 125, 137; προτίμησις, 133; προφυλακή, 123; στασιασμός, 136, 139; σταύρωμα, 138; σταύρωσις, 119; στέρησις, 135; σχετλιασμός, 122; τείχεσις, 125, 136; τειχισμός, 120, 121, 123, 133, 139; τέκνωσις, 138; ὕδρεα, 122; ὑπαγωγή, 139; ὑπεροψία, 134; ὑποτέχισις, 121; ὑποτείχισμα, 119; φρυγανισμός, 122; χειροτονία, 124; χηρεία, 139; χῶσις, 125, 128.

-*t* for -*ed* in Eng. preterits when so pronounced, 101, 103.

-*t* final frequent in English, 103.

Trade-jargons, 31.

Usener, *Epigræca*, xi.

Versification of Latin epigraphic senarii, liv.

Wicliffe Bible, spelling of weak preterits, 97, 98.

Xenophon *Anab.* iv. 75 ὁλίγους τούτους ἀνθρώπους, 49; *Oecon.* xxi. 8 οὗτος, 56; *Hell.* v. 3. 10 αὕτη δίκη, 60.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD.

JULY 1, 1897, TO JULY 1, 1898.

The Bibliographical Record is designed to contain not only publications distinctly philological in character, but also such as deal with the educational aspects of the study of language and literature. It has been compiled from information furnished, at the request of the Executive Committee, by the members themselves.

ABBREVIATIONS: *AJA* = American Journal of Archaeology; *AHR* = American Historical Review; *AJP* = American Journal of Philology; *AJT* = American Journal of Theology; *Archiv* = Archiv für latein. Lexicographie; *Bookm.* = The Bookman; *CR* = Classical Review; *ER* = Educational Review; *HSP* = Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature; *HSCP* = Harvard Studies in Classical Philology; *JAO* = Journal of the American Oriental Society; *JGP* = Journal of Germanic Philology; *LWB* = Library of the World's Best Literature; *MLA* = Publications of the Modern Language Association; *MLN* = Modern Language Notes; *NW* = The New World; *PAPA* = Proceedings of the American Philological Association; *SR* = School Review; *TAPA* = Transactions of the American Philological Association; *WRUB* = Western Reserve University Bulletin.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

- Selected letters of Cicero, edited, with introduction and notes (College Series of Latin Authors), pp. lxxvi + 315; Ginn & Co.
- The same, text edition.
- Rev. *St. Bücheler's Carmina Epigraphica*; *AJP*, xix. 86-90.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

- Translations from Bacchylides; *Century Magazine*, May, 1898.

SIDNEY G. ASHMORE.

- The Olympic Games of 1896, read (by title) before the Classical Conference at Ann Arbor in Spring of 1898. Abstract of same published in *SR*, June, 1898.
- The creation of a national university by coöperation between existing universities, read before the 35th University Convocation of the State of New York, June 28-30, 1897; *Regents' Bulletin*, No. 42, August, 1897.
- A note on *faxo* with the future indicative in Plautus; *PAPA*, July, 1897.
- Some recent discoveries of lost manuscripts; *Parthenon*, April, 1898.

FRANK COLE BABBITT.

- The theatre at Corinth, excavations of 1896; *AJA*, 1897, pp. 481-494.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

- Cicero, Laelius de Amicitia Liber, edited with introductions and notes; Boston: Leach, Shewell, & Sanborn, 1897.
- The foundations of Latin, a book for beginners; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1898.
- Latin inscriptions illustrative of the Latin language, by W. M. Lindsay in Allyn & Bacon's College Latin Series, edited by Charles E. Bennett and J. C. Rolfe; Boston and London: Allyn & Bacon, 1898.
- Selected letters of Pliny the Younger, edited with introduction and notes, by John Howell Westcott in Allyn & Bacon's College Latin Series, edited by Charles E. Bennett and J. C. Rolfe; Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1898.
- Studies in Latin moods and tenses, by H. C. Elmer, No. vi. in *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, edited by Benjamin I. Wheeler, Charles E. Bennett, and George P. Bristol; published by the University, Ithaca, 1898.

- The four-year Latin programmes of the Committee of Twelve; *SR.*, April, 1898.
 Tacitus in *LWBL.*; New York, 1898.
 Cicero through the centuries; *Latin Notes*, vol. ii., No. 2, February, 1898.
- HIRAM H. BICE.
 Elements of Latin, for students of medicine and pharmacy, by Dr. George D. Crothero and Hiram H. Bice; Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Co.
- CHARLES EDWARD BISHOP.
 Expression of the agent with verbal in $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$; abstracted in *SR.*, vi. 437, 438 (Classical Conference).
- MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.
 Indo-European notes: 1. On the vocalism and accent of the middle participle in the Indo-European languages. 2. Ionic $\xi\sigma\kappa\epsilon = \xi\sigma\tau\epsilon$ 'till.' 3. Latin *salūs*: *salvos*. 4. The fractional numerals in Avestan; *TAPA.*, xxviii. 55-59.
 Max Müller's reminiscences; *The Philadelphia Press*, April 10, 1898.
 The position of the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa in Vedic literature; *JAOS.* xix. 1-11.
 The meaning and etymology of the Vedic word *vidātha*; *JAOS.*, xix. 12-18.
 Rev. of Alfred Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, iii. 2; *AJP.*, xviii. 350-353.
- GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.
 Latin *-astro-*; *AJP.*, xviii. 70-73.
 The participle in Hesiod; *Catholic University Bulletin*, iii. 421-471.
 Johns Hopkins doctor dissertation; Washington, 1897.
 The Epic and Attic use of the circumstantial participle; *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xvii. 33, 34.
- JAMES W. BRIGHT.
 Professor March's contributions to English scholarship; *Addresses in honor of Professor Francis A. March*, Easton, 1895, pp. 43-65.
 Kynaston's *Troilus and Cressida*; *The Academy* (London), July 18, 1896.
 A letter on the study of French in our colleges; *Neuere Sprachen*, iv. No. 10.
 Our mother tongue; *The American* (Baltimore), Aug. 22, 1897.
 Germanic Ablaut; *Englische Studien*, xxiv. 150.
 Cynewulf's *Christ*, 495, 528; *MLN.*, 1898, p. 14.
 A Shakespearean quibble; *Ib.*, 1898, pp. 19, 20.
 Hobby-Horsical; *Ib.*, 1898, p. 121.
 The wanderer, 78-84; *Ib.*, 1898, pp. 176, 177.
 Rooters; *Nation*, June 2, 1898.
- ISAAC B. BURGESS.
 A selective bibliography for use in framing classical programmes for secondary schools; *SR.*, Nov. 1897.
 Rev. of Humphrey's *Quintus Curtius Rufus*; *SR.*, Nov. 1897.
 Value of Latin in preparatory study; *School Journal*, Mar. 26, 1898.
- C. G. CHILD.
 King or cony; *MLN.*, Jan. 1898, 13: 63, 64.
- EDWARD B. CLAPP.
 Plutarch; *LWBL.*, New York, 1897.
 Notes on Homeric meter; *SR.*, June, 1898, pp. 472-474; 1898 (Classical Conference).
- WILLARD K. CLEMENT.
 The use of *enim* in Plautus and Terence, doctor dissertation; Lord Baltimore Press, 1897; also in *AJP.*, xviii. 402-416.
- GEORGE STUART COLLINS.
 Selections from Jean Paul Friedrich Richter, edited with introduction

and notes, p. 163; American Book Co., 1898.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Traces of Indo-European accentuation in Latin; *TAPA.*, xxviii. 92 ff.

Sammlung d. Griech. Dialekt-Inschriften, hg. von Collitz u. Bechtel, III. Bd., 2 Hälfte, 1. Heft: Die Inschriften von Lakonien, Tarent u. s. w., bearb. von R. Meister; Göttingen, 1898.

GEORGE H. DENNY.

The determination of the character of the subjunctive clauses with adjective and substantive predicates and phrases; Lynchburg, Va.: J. P. Bell Publishing Co., 1897, p. 57.

B. L. D'OOGHE.

Caesar's Gallic War (Allen & Greenough's edition), reëdited by J. B. Greenough, B. L. D'Ooghe, and M. G. Daniell, pp. lx + 616; Ginn & Co., 1898.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Notes on antistrophic verbal response in Attic tragedy; *PAPA.*, xxviii., xi.-xiv.

Rev. of Haigh's Tragic drama of the Greeks; *CR.*, xii. 37-41.

Encore Hérodote I. 86; *Revue de Philologie*, xxii. 182, 183.

JAMES C. EGBERT, JR.

Archaeological news, Roman epigraphy; *AJA.* (2d series), No. 4 and 5 of vol. i. 1897.

Rev. of The ruins and excavations of ancient Rome by R. Lanciani; *Bookm.*, March, 1898.

Some light on Roman life; *N. Y. Times*, March 5, 1898.

HERBERT CHARLES ELMER.

The supposed *may*-potential use of the Latin subjunctive; *PAPA.*, xxviii., xvi.-xix.

The distinction between the Latin present and perfect tenses in ex-

pressions of contingent futurity; *PAPA.*, xxviii., xxxvii.-xl.

Studies in Latin moods and tenses; *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, vi. (The Macmillan Company), pp. ix + 231.

The aorist injunctive in Latin; *CR.*, March, 1898, pp. 100-104.

A neglected use of the Latin subjunctive; *CR.*, May, 1898, pp. 199-205.

VERNON J. EMERY.

On the definition of certain rhetorical tenses; *AJP.*, xviii. No. 2.

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.

The future life in Homer; *AJT.*, July, 1897.

Plutarch's quotations from early Greek philosophers; *TAPA.*, 1897.

Notes on Empedokles; *CR.*, Feb. 1898.

Lessons on Greek religion; Chicago, 1897.

The first philosophers of Greece; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., and Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.

Literary influence in the development of Greek religion; *Biblical World*, March, 1898, pp. 98-111.

The significance of sacrifice in the Homeric poems; *The New World*, June, 1898, pp. 335-349.

HENRY RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.

Tyrtæus, Archilochus, and their successors in the development of Greek lyric; *LWBL.*

Literary clubs in ancient Greece; *Chit-Chat Club*, San Francisco, Nov. 8, 1897.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Textual notes and queries on Plautus, I. Mostellaria; *AJP.*, xviii. 168-188.

Etymology of Latin *nihil*; *Ib.*, pp. 462, 463.

On the etymology of *cortina*, *cortex*; *CR.*, xi. 298, 299.

- Partial obliquity in questions of re-
tort; *Ib.*, pp. 344, 345.
A stylistic value of the parenthetic
purpose clause; *Ib.*, p. 346.
Etymological notes, i. *Ingens* once
more, ii. *Mons* 'peak,' iii. *In-*
digetes; *Ib.* xii. 17-20.
German *Gipfel*, English *Squawk*;
JGP., i. 347.
Rev. of Dottin's *Des désinences ver-*
bales en r en Sanskrit, en Italique
et en Celtique; *AJP.*, xix. 95-97.
- O. M. FERNALD.
Rev. of Harper's Dictionary of
classical literature and antiqui-
ties; *AJP.*, xviii. 78-84.
- THOMAS FITZ-HUGH.
A questionable tradition in Latin
historical syntax; *PAPA.*, xxviii.,
xxxiv.-xxxvii.
The philosophy of the humanities,
pp. 64; *University of Chicago*
Press, Chicago, 1897.
- HAROLD N. FOWLER.
Portraits of Virgil; *WRUB*, new
series, vol. i., No. 2, April, 1898,
pp. 28-37; also in the *SR.*, June,
1898.
- THOMAS DWIGHT GOODELL.
A journey in Thessaly; *The Cen-*
tury, vol. liv. (August, 1897), pp.
493-503.
Shall we still read Greek tragedy?
The Atlantic, vol. lxxxi. (April,
1898), pp. 474-482.
- ALFRED GUDEMAN.
The *Agricola* of Tacitus: a biog-
raphy; *PAPA.*, xxviii., xlviii.-liii.
Notes to the *Agricola*; *CR.*, xii.
(Oct. 1897), pp. 325-332.
Tacitean exegesis; paper read at
the Ann Arbor Classical Confer-
ence, April 1, 1898.
Rev. of Holm's Greek history, vol.
iv. (Engl. Transl.); *The Citizen*,
pp. 130 f.
- W. G. HALE.
The Roman pronunciation of Latin;
SR., June, 1898. (A paper read
at the meeting of the Classical
Conference at Ann Arbor, April,
1898.)
The American School of Classical
Studies in Rome; *Ib.*, and on the
same occasion.
- KARL P. HARRINGTON.
The purpose-accusative in Proper-
tius; *PAPA.*, xxiii., xxviii.
The use of translations; *SR.*, vi.
474, 475.
- T. W. HEERMANCE.
(Joint author with G. D. Lord.)
Pre-Mycenaean graves in Corinth;
AJA., Second Series, i. (1897),
pp. 313-332.
- OTTO HELLER.
Goethe and the philosophy of
Schopenhauer; *JGP.*, I. (iii.),
1898.
Emendation of a passage in Goethe's
Faust; *MLN.*, May, 1898.
Eine Seeschlange: history of a
spurious Schiller-letter; *Westliche*
Post, 1897.
Schiller und Goethe in three arti-
cles. Articles 1 and 2 being in
part a critical review of H.
Grimm's Goethe, Art. 3 a defense
of Charlotte v. Stein against Keil,
Hoefel, Stahr, etc., 1897.
- ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.
Brief notes to the *Rudens* of Plautus.
Issued privately.
- WILLIAM H. HULME.
Malchus (reprint of OE. text);
JGP., i. 431-441.
An American literature, and the
"great American novel";
WRUB., i. No. 2., pp. 75-82.
- A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.
Avesta, Firdausī. Hāliz, Jāmī, Jaya-
deva, Kālidāsa, Nizāmī, Jalāl-ad-
dīn Rūmī, Sa'dī in *LWBL.*
Ancient India and Persia, their lit-
erature and their civilization,
twelve lectures; University Ex-
tension Syllabus 27, Rutgers Col-
lege, N. J.

Translations of several Hindu and Persian stories in Bertha Palmer's *Classic Literature of Many Nations*, p. 68 seq.; New York: The Macmillan Co.

Notice of West's Marvels of Zoroastrianism, S. B. E., vol. xlvii.; *The Independent*, N. Y., May 28, 1898.

Notice of The International Congress of Orientalists at Paris, September 5-12, 1897; *Indogerm. Forsch.*, ix. Anz. 2, pp. 164-169, June 30, 1898.

Rev. of George Brandes On Shakespeare; *Bookm.*, N. Y., vii. 411-413, July 1, 1898.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Melanchthon as a philologist and educator; *New Haven Sunday Register*, ix. 8, 1897.

Historical sketch of Phi Beta Kappa; *Catalogue of Yale Chapter*, pp. 5-12, 1898.

J. C. KIRTLAND, JR.

Note on the word *orator*; *CR.*, xi. 351.

Note on Ter. Ad., 223, 224; *CR.*, xi. 352.

An American edition of Cicero's letters; *Bookm.*, Jan. 1898.

Bennett's Cicero; *SR.*, May, 1898.

WILLIAM HAMILTON KIRK.

Etiam in Plautus and Terence; *AJP.*, xviii. 26-42.

ῥέμειν and ῥέμεισθαι; *AJP.*, xviii. 76, 77.

Rev. of Abbott's Selected letters of Cicero; *AJP.*, xix. 93-95.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Rev. of Kirkland, Satires and epistles of Horace; *CR.*, xi. 358-359.

Notes on Horace; *AJP.*, xviii. 325-338.

Archaism in Aulus Gellius; *PAPA.*, July, 1897, v.-vii.

Brief notes; *PAPA.*, July, 1897; xxvi.-xxvii.

C. R. LANMAN.

Obituary of F. D. Allen; *Nation*, August 19, 1897.

The milk-drinking Haṅsas of Sanskrit poetry; *JAOS.*, xix. 2d half, pp. 151-158.

WILLIAM CRANSTON LAWTON.

Over thirty articles in *LWBL.*, e.g., Cicero, Euripides, Hesiod, Hom. Hymns, Livy, Menander, Suetonius, Virgil, Xenophon.

Mythology; *Critic*, Jan. 1898.

Articles in *Chau/auquan*, 1898; (April), Virgil, pp. 29-34; (May), A study of literature in Rome, pp. 121-127; (June), Influence of Latin upon English, pp. 243-249.

A professor of the classics; *Nation*, July 29, 1897.

THOMAS BOND LINDSAY.

Juvenal, Terence; *LWBL.*

HENRY F. LINSKOTT.

The syncretism of the locative and instrumental in Latin; *PAPA.*, xxviii., lv.

FREDERICK LUTZ.

English etymology by Dr. Friedrich Kluge of Freiburg, and Frederick Lutz, Albion, Mich., cloth, 242 pp.; Trübner, Strassburg; Ginn & Co., Boston.

The German public schools and the secondary schools; *Bay View Monthly*, Jan.

H. W. MAGOUN.

Early religion of the Hindus; *Bibl. Sacra*, liv. Oct. 1897, pp. 603-633; and lv. Jan. 1898, pp. 92-113; and April, 1898, pp. 296-321.

Apām Napāt in the Rig Veda; *JAOS.*, xix. 1898, pp. 137-144.

The original Hindu triad; *Ib.*, pp. 145-150.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.

On the date and interpretation of Chaucer's complaint of Mars, Studies and Notes in Philology

- and Literature, vol. v. (Child Memorial Volume), pp. 107-126; Ginn & Co., 1896 (issued 1897).
Specimens of the pre-Shakspearean drama, vol. i. pp. xxxvii + 618; vol. ii. pp. vii + 590; Ginn & Co., 1897.
- JOHN L. MARGRANDER.
Notes on two passages of Sophocles' Antigone; *PAPA*. xxviii., lvii.-lviii.
- MAURICE W. MATHER.
Notes on selections from Catullus and Tibullus; selections from Latin poets; Harvard University, 1897.
- CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE.
Julius Firmicus Maternus, Der Heide und der Christ; Munich, 1897, pp. 54.
Note on the canonicity of the apocalypse of John; *AJT.*, ii. 638-640.
Dediticius, dediticiorum numero, daticius; *Archiv*, xi. 81-85.
The enrichment of the classical course in secondary schools (abstract of address before the Classical Conference at Ann Arbor, April 1, 1898); *SR.*, June, 1898.
Rev. of Anecdota Maredsolana, iii., pts. i. and ii.; *AJT.*, ii. 420 ff.
- E. P. MORRIS.
The Captives and Trinummus of Plautus, with introduction and notes; Boston: Ginn & Co., 1898.
The subjunctive in independent sentences in Plautus; *AJP.*, xviii. (1897), 70, pp. 133-167; 71, pp. 275-301; 72, pp. 383-401.
- WILFRED P. MUSTARD.
The Delphin classics; *PAPA.*, July, 1897, pp. lix-lxi.
Report of Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, vol. lii.; *AJP.*, xviii. 239-241, and 488-491.
Note on the birds of the Georgics; *Critic*, Jan. 29, 1898.
Note on Tennyson and Catullus; *Nation*, May 12, 1898.
- Article on Tennyson and Horace; *Nation*, June 9, 1898.
- FRANK W. NICOLSON.
The saliva superstition in classical literature; *HSCP.*, viii. 23-40.
- CHARLES POMEROY PARKER.
The true history of the reign of Nero; *The New World*, June, 1898, vii. 313-335.
- HARRY THURSTON PECK.
The personal equation; Harper & Bros., 1897.
The progress of Fonetik Refaurm; *Bookm.*, Nov. 1897.
What is good English? *Bookm.*, April, 1898.
A dictionary of classical literature and antiquities (2d ed. revised); Harper & Bros., 1898.
- B. PERRIN.
Eight books of Homer's Odyssey, for the use of schools, by B. Perrin and T. D. Seymour; Boston: Ginn & Co., 1897, pp. lxx + 453.
The ethics and amenities of Greek historiography, president's address at the 29th annual session of the Am. Phil. Ass., Bryn Mawr, 1897; *AJP.*, xviii. 255-274.
Rev. of Hogarth's Philip and Alexander of Macedon; *AHR.*, iii. 128-130.
- L. S. POTWIN.
Here and there in the Greek New Testament, 12mo, pp. 220; Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago, New York, Toronto, 1898.
- HENRY PREBLE.
Latin composition in the preparatory schools; *SR.*, April, 1898, pp. 261-269.
- FRANK E. ROCKWOOD.
Rev. of Epigrafia Latina by Serafino Ricci; *CR.*, June, 1898.
- JOHN C. ROLFE.
A, ab, abs; *Archiv*, x. 465-505.
An epoch-making lexicon; *Bookm.*, Nov. 1897.

JULIUS SACHS.

Modern languages as an alternative in college admission requirements; *ER.*, July, 1896.

What is the present consensus of opinion as to the most important problems in preparatory and collegiate education? *SR.*, March, 1898.

JARED W. SCUDDER.

Rev. of Greenough and Kittredge's Select orations of Cicero; *SR.*, Jan. 1898, pp. 49, 51.

Latin in the grammar school, a paper read before the Associated Academic Principals in a conference held at Syracuse, N. Y., Dec. 29th, 1897, and published in the Regents' *Bulletin*, No. 44, March, 1898, pp. 48-57.

HELEN M. SEARLES.

A lexicographical study of the Greek dialect inscriptions; University of Chicago, *Classical Studies*, ii. 1-114.

EDWARD S. SHELDON.

On Anglo-French and middle English *au* for French *a* before a nasal; *HSPL.*, v. 69-75.

E. G. SIHLER.

Lucretius and Cicero; *TAPA.*, 1898.

The Varia of Paul de Lagarde in the library of New York University, and their relation to classical philology; New York University *Triangle*, vol. iv. 199-201.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

Socrates, Thucydides; *LWBL.*

Mute and liquid in Greek melic poetry; *TAPA.*, xxviii. 111-143.

HENRY ALFRED TODD.

Gaston Paris: Romance philologist and member of the French Academy; *MLA.*, xii. No. 4, 341-354.

Report on Romania for 1895; *AJP.*, xviii. 357-362 and 484-488.

MINTON WARREN.

Report of the director of the American School of Classical Studies at Rome for the years 1896-1897; *AJA.*, Second Series, i. 137-155.

Rev. of Conway, the Italic dialects; *AJA.*, xix. 90-93.

WINIFRED WARREN.

A study of conjunctive temporal clauses in Thucydides, pp. 76; Bryn Mawr doctor dissertation, 1897.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

The Berlin fragment of the Madelghis; *JGP.*, i. 239.

Vollstatter's Gedicht von des Teufels Töchtern; *JGP.*, i. 249.

Rev. of Streitberg, Gotisches Elementarbuch; *MLN.*, xii. 498.

JOHN HOWELL WESTCOTT.

Selections from Pliny's letters, College Latin Series; Allyn & Bacon, Boston and Chicago, pp. xli + 285.

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

Aeschylus; *LWBL.*

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

The metaphor in the epic poems of Publius Papinius Statius, dissertation presented for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University in 1896; published by John Murphy & Co., Baltimore, 1898.

B. D. WOODWARD.

Article on Comines; *LWBL.*

Recent work of the Rumanian Academy; *MLA.*, xii. No. 4, 7-14; new series, vol. v. No. 4.

Editor of *Le Mariage de Gabrielle*, par Gabriel Lesueur, with English notes; Wm. R. Jenkins, pp. 275.

Voltaire's prose, extracts; D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, pp. xxv + 454. (Edited in collaboration with Prof. Ad. Cohn.)

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1898-99.

PRESIDENT.

CLEMENT L. SMITH.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

ABBY LEACH.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The above-named Officers, and —

FRANCIS A. MARCH.

ELMER T. MERRILL.

TRACY PECK.

ANDREW F. WEST.

JOHN HENRY WRIGHT.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.¹

1898-99.

- William F. Abbot, High School, Worcester, Mass. (38 William St.). 1893.
 Prof. F. F. Abbott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1886.
 Prof. Charles D. Adams, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1892.
 Dr. Cyrus Adler, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. 1883.
 George Gillespie Allen, 18 Lowell St., Malden, Mass. 1885.
 Dr. James T. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1898.
 Prof. Francis G. Allinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1893.
 Principal Harlan P. Amen, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1897.
 Prof. Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington. 1887.
 Prof. Alfred Williams Anthony, Cobb Divinity School, Lewiston, Me. 1890.
 Dr. W. Muss-Arnolt, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
 Dr. R. Arrowsmith, American Book Company, Washington Square, New York,
 N. Y. 1898.
 Prof. Sidney G. Ashmore, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y. 1885.
 E. H. Atherton, Girls' Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1894.
 Clarence W. Ayer, 45 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass. 1895.
 Prof. Frank Cole Babbitt, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1897.
 Charles W. Bain, University of Sewanee Grammar School, Sewanee, Tenn. 1889.
 Prof. Robert Baird, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1893.
 H. L. Baker, 70 Griswold St., Detroit, Mich. 1889.
 Dr. C. H. Balg, 704 Walnut St., Milwaukee, Wis. 1890.
 Prof. Francis K. Ball, Oberlin, O. 1894.
 Dr. Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1879.
 Cecil K. Bancroft, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (102 North College). 1898.
 J. Edmund Barss, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1897.
 George K. Bartholomew, English and Classical School, Cincinnati, O. 1893.
 Dr. William N. Bates, 56 Dana St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
 Prof. William J. Battle, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1893.
 Prof. Isbon T. Beckwith, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1884.
 Charles H. Beeson, 103 Moss Ave., Peoria, Ill. 1897.

¹ This list has been corrected up to November 20, 1898; permanent addresses are given, as far as may be. Where the residence is left blank, the members in question are in Europe. The Secretary and the Publishers beg to be kept informed of all changes of address.

- Prof. A. J. Bell, Victoria University, Toronto (17 Avenue Road). 1887.
 Prof. Charles E. Bennett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (7 South Ave.). 1882.
 John Ira Bennett, Union University, Schenectady, N. Y. 1897.
 Prof. Charles W. Benton, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1890.
 Thomas S. Bettens, 130 West Eighty-seventh St., New York, N. Y. 1884.
 Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1884.
 Hiram H. Bice, 52 West Sixty-fifth St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
 William F. Biddle, 4305 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.
 Dr. C. P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1894.
 Prof. Charles Edward Bishop, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 1890.
 William Warner Bishop, 74 Pitcher St., Detroit, Mich. 1895.
 Prof. Robert W. Blake, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1894.
 Prof. M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1882.
 Prof. Willis H. Boccock, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1890.
 Prof. C. W. E. Body, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. (9 Chelsea Sq.) 1887.
 Dr. George M. Bolling, Catholic University of America, Brookland, D. C. 1897.
 Prof. D. Bonbright, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1892.
 Prof. A. L. Bondurant, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1892.
 Dr. George Willis Botsford, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (45 Walker St.). 1894.
 Prof. B. L. Bowen, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.
 Prof. Charles F. Bradley, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1886.
 Prof. J. Everett Brady, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1891.
 Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1876.
 Dr. Josiah Bridge, Westminster School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y. 1888.
 Prof. Walter R. Bridgman, Lake Forest University, Lake Forest, Ill. 1890.
 Prof. James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1887.
 Miss Caroline G. Brombacher, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (399 Clermont Ave.). 1897.
 Prof. Jabez Brooks, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1708 Laurel Ave.). 1887.
 Prof. Samuel Brooks, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich. 1893.
 Prof. Demarchus C. Brown, Butler College, Irvington, Ind. 1893.
 Prof. F. W. Brown, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 1893.
 Prof. Mariana Brown, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. 1892.
 Dr. Carleton L. Brownson, College of the City of New York, N. Y. (New Rochelle, N. Y.). 1892.
 C. F. Brusie, Mount Pleasant Academy, Sing Sing, N. Y. 1894.
 Prof. A. H. Buck, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1893.
 Prof. Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
 Miss Mary H. Buckingham, 19 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass. 1897.
 Walter H. Buell, 243 Jefferson Ave., Scranton, Pa. 1887.
 Prof. William Lewis Bulkley, Claflin University, Orangeburg, S. C. 1895.
 H. J. Burchell, Jr., Barnard College, New York, N. Y. 1895.
 Isaac B. Burgess, Morgan Park Academy, Morgan Park, Ill. 1892.
 Prof. Sylvester Burnham, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1885.

- Dr. William S. Burrage, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1898.
Prof. Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1878.
Prof. Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. 1869.
Prof. A. Guyot Cameron, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
Prof. Edward Capps, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1889.
Prof. William H. Carpenter, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.
Dr. Mitchell Carroll, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1894.
Prof. Frank Carter, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. 1897.
Pres. Franklin Carter, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1871.
Prof. Jesse Benedict Carter, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1898.
Prof. Mary Emily Case, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1895.
Prof. Clarence F. Castle, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1888.
Prof. William Van Allen Catron, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
Miss Eva Channing, Forest Hill St., Jamaica Plain, Mass. 1883.
Prof. A. C. Chapin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1888.
Prof. Henry Leland Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1892.
Prof. S. R. Cheek, Centre College of Kentucky, Danville, Ky. 1890.
Dr. Clarence G. Child, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (2118 De Lancey Place). 1897.
Bradbury L. Cilley, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1884.
Prof. Edward B. Clapp, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1 Bushnell Pl.). 1886.
Prof. Emma Kirkland Clark, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. 1896.
Prof. J. S. Clark, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1891.
Prof. Willard K. Clement, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho. 1892.
Prof. George Stuart Collins, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1897.
Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1887.
William T. Colville, Carbondale, Pa. 1884.
D. Y. Comstock, St. Johnsbury, Vt. 1888.
Prof. Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del. 1897.
Dr. Arthur Stoddard Cooley, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (27 Kingston St., Boston). 1896.
J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., Chestnut Hill, Mass. 1884.
Dr. Frederic T. Cooper, 177 Warburton Ave., Yonkers, N. Y. 1895.
Principal W. T. Couper, Booneville, N. Y. 1895.
Prof. William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1888.
Edward G. Coy, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1888.
Prof. W. H. Crogman, Clark University, South Atlanta, Ga. 1898.
Prof. John M. Cross, Kingston, N. Y. 1885.
Prof. George O. Curme, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1890.
William L. Cushing, Westminster School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y. 1888.
Dr. Charles H. S. Davis, Meriden, Conn. 1891.
Prof. George H. Denny, Hampden-Sidney College, Hampden-Sidney, Va. 1897.
Prof. Samuel C. Derby, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.
Prof. James H. Dillard, Tulane University, New Orleans, La. 1894.
Prof. Howard Freeman Doane, Doane College, Crete, Neb. 1897.
Prof. B. L. D'Ooge, State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Mich. 1895.
Prof. Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1873.

- Louis H. Dow, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1895.
 Prof. Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1897.
 Prof. Maurice Edwards Dunham, University of Colorado, Boulder, Col. 1890.
 Miss Emily Helen Dutton, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1898.
 Dr. Mortimer Lamson Earle, Barnard College, New York, N. Y. 1890.
 Prof. William Wells Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1882.
 Prof. Herman L. Ebeling, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1892.
 Prof. William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1893.
 W. A. Eckels, 210 McMechen St., Baltimore, Md. 1894.
 Thomas H. Eckfeldt, New Bedford, Mass. 1883.
 Homer J. Edmiston, 358 Harvard St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
 Dr. Katharine M. Edwards, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1893.
 Prof. James C. Egbert, Jr., Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1889.
 Prof. A. Marshall Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
 Prof. W. A. Elliott, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1897.
 Prof. Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1887.
 Prof. L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1883.
 Miss E. Antoinette Ely, The Clifton School, Cincinnati, O. 1893.
 Prof. Edgar A. Emens, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. (727 Crouse Ave.). 1895.
 Prof. Annie Crosby Emery, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
 Vernon J. Emery, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1893.
 C. W. Ernst, Back Bay, Boston, Mass. 1872.
 Prof. George Taylor Ettinger, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1896.
 Prof. Margaret J. Evans, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1891.
 Rev. Dr. W. E. Evans, Columbia, S. C. 1897.
 Dr. Arthur Fairbanks, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1886.
 Prof. H. Rushton Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.
 Prof. Charles E. Fay, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass. 1885.
 Prof. Edwin W. Fay, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va. 1889.
 Pres. Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. 1888.
 Prof. O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1876.
 F. J. Fessenden, Berkeley School, 20 West Forty-fourth St., New York City. 1890.
 Prof. Edward Fitch, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1890.
 Prof. Thomas Fitz-Hugh, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1891.
 Miss Helen C. Flint, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1897.
 F. S. Fosdick, High School, Buffalo, N. Y. 1896.
 Prof. Frank H. Fowler, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 1893.
 Prof. Harold N. Fowler, Western Reserve University (College for Women), Cleveland, O. (49 Cornell St.). 1885.
 Dr. Susan B. Franklin, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1890.
 Prof. George A. H. Fraser, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. 1894.
 Dr. I. F. Frisbee, Latin School, Lewiston, Me. 1898.
 Prof. A. L. Fuller, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1889.

- Prof. Charles Kelsey Gaines, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. 1890.
Dr. William Gallagher, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass. 1886.
Frank A. Gallup, Colgate Academy, Hamilton, N. Y. 1898.
Prof. Charles Mills Gayley, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1895.
Prof. Henry Gibbons, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (405 South 41st St.). 1890.
Prof. Seth K. Gifford, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1891.
Prof. John Wesley Gilbert, Payne Institute, Athens, Ga. 1897.
Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1876.
Prof. Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (35 Edgehill Road). 1883.
Ralph L. Goodrich, U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark. 1882.
Dr. Charles J. Goodwin, Farmington, Me. 1891.
Prof. William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (5 Follen St.). 1870.
Prof. Herbert Eveleth Greene, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1890.
Prof. Wilber J. Greer, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1892.
Prof. James O. Griffin, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1896.
Prof. Alfred Gudeman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1889.
Dr. Charles Burton Gulick, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (18 Walker St.). 1894.
Prof. William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (5833 Monroe Ave.). 1882.
Prof. Arthur P. Hall, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1886.
Prof. F. A. Hall, Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 1896.
Prof. Randall C. Hall, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. (245 West Forty-eighth St.). 1888.
Charles S. Halsey, Union Classical Institute, Schenectady, N. Y. 1887.
William McD. Halsey, 34 West Fortieth St., New York, N. Y. 1886.
Prof. T. F. Hamblin, Bucknell University, Lewisburgh, Pa. 1895.
Adelbert Hamilton, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1895.
Prof. William A. Hammond, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1897.
Principal John Calvin Hanna, High School, Oak Park, Ill. (209 South East Ave.). 1896.
Prof. G. R. Hardie, St. Laurence University, Canton, N. Y. 1896.
B. F. Harding, Belmont School, Belmont, Mass. 1889.
Prof. Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1869.
Prof. Albert Granger Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.
Pres. William R. Harper, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
Prof. Karl P. Harrington, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1892.
Prof. W. A. Harris, Baylor University, Waco, Tex. 1895.
Prof. J. E. Harry, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky. 1896.
Prof. Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1871.
Prof. Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
Dr. Edward Southworth Hawes, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1888.
Dr. H. W. Hayley, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1897.
Prof. F. M. Hazen, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1896.

- Theodore Woolsey Heermance, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (399 Berkeley Hall). 1897.
- Prof. Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1896.
- Prof. George Hempl, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1895.
- Prof. George A. Hench, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1895.
- Prof. G. L. Hendrickson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.
- Prof. H. N. Herrick, Eureka College, Eureka, Ill. 1896.
- Prof. John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1886.
- Prof. Henry T. Hildreth, Roanoke College, Salem, Va. 1896.
- H. H. Hilton, 9 Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.
- Prof. Arthur W. Hodgman, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1896.
- Prof. Horace A. Hoffman, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. 1893.
- Prof. W. D. Hooper, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1894.
- Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (235 Bishop St.). 1883.
- Dr. Herbert M. Hopkins, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2644 Dwight Way). 1898.
- Rev. George B. Hopson, St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. 1898.
- Prof. William A. Houghton, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1892.
- Prof. Albert A. Howard, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (8 Hilliard St.). 1892.
- Prof. Frederick H. Howard, Colgate Academy, Hamilton, N. Y. 1894.
- Prof. George E. Howes, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. 1896.
- Prof. Frank G. Hubbard, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
- Dr. J. H. Huddilston, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1898.
- Dr. Ray Greene Huling, 101 Trowbridge St., Cambridge, Mass. 1892.
- L. C. Hull, Lawrenceville, N. J. 1889.
- Dr. W. H. Hulme, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1895.
- Prof. Milton W. Humphreys, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1871.
- Prof. A. J. Huntington, Columbia University, Washington, D. C. (1010 N St., N. W.). 1892.
- Dr. George B. Hussey, East Orange, N. J. 1887.
- Prof. J. Corrin Hutchinson, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1894.
- Prof. Edmund Morris Hyde, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. 1883.
- Prof. Henry Hyvernatt, Catholic University of America, Brookland, D. C. 1897.
- Prof. J. W. D. Ingersoll, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (399 Berkeley Hall). 1897.
- Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass. 1888.
- Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.
- Prof. George E. Jackson, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1890.
- Charles S. Jacobs, Albion College, Albion, Mich. 1897.
- Prof. M. W. Jacobus, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (149 High St.). 1893.
- Prof. Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (113 Walker St.). 1882.
- Prof. J. Haywode Jennings, Martin, Tenn. 1892.
- Dr. Charles W. L. Johnson, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1897.

- Henry C. Johnson, 32 Nassau St., New York, N. Y. 1885.
Prof. William H. Johnson, Denison University, Granville, O. 1895.
Principal Augustine Jones, Friends' School, Providence, R. I. 1896.
Dr. Robert P. Keep, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn. 1872.
George Dwight Kellogg, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (90 South Middle). 1897.
Pres. Martin Kellogg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1884.
Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1890.
H. W. Kent, Norwich, Conn. 1890.
Prof. John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1889.
Miss Lida Shaw King, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. (900 St. Mark's Ave.). 1896.
Prof. Robert A. King, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1893.
Dr. William Hamilton Kirk, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1898.
Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1887.
J. C. Kirtland, Jr., Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1895.
Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Hilliard St.). 1884.
Dr. William H. Klapp, Academy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1324 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1894.
Camillo von Klenze, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1895.
Dr. Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York, N. Y. (1773 Sedgwick Ave.). 1892.
Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. 1889.
Prof. A. G. Laird, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1890.
Prof. William A. Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.
Prof. W. B. Langsdorf, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1895.
Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Farrar St.). 1877.
Lewis H. Lapham, 28 Ferry St., New York, N. Y. 1880.
Prof. C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y. 1880.
Prof. William Cranston Lawton, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y. (302 Carlton Ave.). 1888.
Prof. Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1888.
Prof. Emory B. Lease, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1895.
Dr. J. T. Lees, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. 1888.
Prof. Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1880.
Prof. Alonzo Linn, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1892.
Prof. Henry F. Linscott, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1896.
Prof. Gonzalez Lodge, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1888.
Prof. George D. Lord, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1887.
D. O. S. Lowell, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1894.
Prof. Frederick Lutz, Albion College, Albion, Mich. 1883.
A. H. Mabley, 45 Oakdale St., Cleveland, O. 1894.
Chancellor George E. MacLean, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. 1891.
Miss Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. H. W. Magoun, Redfield College, Redfield, S. D. 1891.
Prof. J. H. T. Main, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. 1891.
Prof. J. Irving Manatt, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1875.

- Prof. John M. Manly, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1896.
 Prof. F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1869.
 Prof. F. A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1884.
 John L. Margrander, 293 North Ave., Rochester, N. Y. 1896.
 Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
 Prof. C. B. Martin, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1895.
 Prof. Winfred R. Martin, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1879.
 Miss Ellen F. Mason, 1 Walnut St., Boston, Mass. 1885.
 Dr. Maurice W. Mather, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (13 Mt. Auburn St.). 1894.
 W. Gordon McCabe, University School, Richmond, Va. 1876.
 Dr. Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.
 Prof. J. H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1871.
 Prof. George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O. 1885.
 Miss Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie Female Seminary, Painesville, O. 1881.
 Prof. H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1884.
 Prof. W. J. McMurtry, Yankton College, Yankton, S. D. 1893.
 James D. Meeker, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1897.
 Prof. Frank Ivan Merchant, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D. 1898.
 Prof. Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1883.
 Prof. William A. Merrill, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1886.
 Prof. Charles L. Michener, Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia. 1895.
 Prof. C. W. E. Miller, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.
 Dr. Richard A. Minckwitz, Central High School, Kansas City, Mo. 1895.
 Charles A. Mitchell, University School, Cleveland, O. 1893.
 Prof. Clifford H. Moore, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1889.
 Prof. Frank G. Moore, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1888.
 Prof. George F. Moore, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. 1885.
 Prof. J. Leverett Moore, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1887.
 Prof. Lewis B. Moore, Howard University, Washington, D. C. 1896.
 Paul E. More. 1896.
 Prof. James D. Morgan, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1897.
 Prof. Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (Hubbard Park). 1887.
 Prof. Edward P. Morris, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (53 Edgehill Road). 1886.
 Frederick S. Morrison, Public High School, Hartford, Conn. 1890.
 Prof. Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York, N. Y. 1898.
 Prof. George F. Mull, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1896.
 Prof. Augustus T. Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.
 Prof. Wilfred P. Mustard, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1892.
 Prof. Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. (252 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.). 1872.
 Dr. Barker Newhall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1891.
 Prof. Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1888.

- Prof. Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1871.
Prof. Richard Norton, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy.
1897.
Prof. Hanns Oertel, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (31 York Sq.). 1892.
Prof. Edward T. Owen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1896.
Prof. W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1875.
Prof. William A. Packard, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1872.
Prof. Arthur H. Palmer, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (42 Mansfield St.).
1885.
Dr. William F. Palmer, West View, Cuyahoga County, O. 1893.
Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (60 Shepard St.).
1884.
Dr. W. H. Parks, care of Wells, Fargo, & Co., Paris, France. 1888.
Dr. James M. Paton, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1887.
Dr. Charles Peabody, 197 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
Prof. Ernest M. Pease, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
1887.
Prof. Harry Thurston Peck, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1887.
Prof. Tracy Peck, American School of Classical Studies, Rome, Italy. 1871.
Miss Frances Pellett, 138 Front St., Binghamton, N. Y. 1893.
Prof. Emma M. Perkins, Western Reserve University (College for Women), Cleve-
land, O. 1892.
Prof. Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (136 Farnam Hall).
1879.
Prof. Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (133 East 55th St.).
1882.
Prof. William E. Peters, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1892.
Prof. John Pickard, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1893.
Dr. William Taggard Piper, 179 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1885.
Prof. Samuel Ball Platner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, O. 1885.
Prof. William Carey Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (53 Lloyd St.).
1872.
Prof. John Pollard, Richmond College, Richmond, Va. 1892.
Prof. Samuel Porter, Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C. 1869.
Prof. William Porter, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 1888.
Prof. Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1886.
Prof. Franklin H. Potter, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1898.
Prof. L. S. Potwin, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
(2108 Euclid Ave.). 1881.
Henry Preble, 42 Stuyvesant Place, New Brighton, Staten Island, N. Y. 1882.
William K. Prentice, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.
Prof. Ferris W. Price, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 1895.
Prof. Thomas R. Price, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (263 West 45th St.).
1880.
Prof. Benjamin F. Prince, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. 1893.
Prof. M. M. Ramsey, Columbian University, Washington, D. C. 1894.
Prof. John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky. 1885.

Prof. Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (213 Durfee Hall).
1884.

Prof. Leon J. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1895.

Dr. Ernst Riess, Manhattan College, New York, N. Y. (2293 Seventh Ave.). 1895.

Prof. Edmund Y. Robbins, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.

Dr. Arthur W. Roberts, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.

Harley F. Roberts, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (267 Lawrance Hall).
1888.

Principal Oscar D. Robinson, High School, Albany, N. Y. 1896.

Prof. W. A. Robinson, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. 1888.

Prof. Joseph C. Rockwell, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1896.

Prof. F. E. Rockwood, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1885.

Alfred G. Rolfe, High School, Pottstown, Pa. 1895.

Prof. John C. Rolfe, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (602 Monroe St.).
1890.

Dr. Julius Sachs, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y. 1875.

Benjamin H. Sanborn, Wellesley, Mass. 1890.

Prof. Myron R. Sanford, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1894.

Joseph H. Sawyer, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass. 1897.

Prof. W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O. 1882.

Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1894.

Vice-Chanc. Henry A. Scomp, American Temperance University, Harriman,
Tenn. 1897.

Dr. Charles P. G. Scott, Radnor, Pa. 1880.

Edmund D. Scott, Holyoke High School, P.O. Box 578, Holyoke, Mass. 1894.

Prof. John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1898.

Prof. Henry S. Scribner, Western University of Pennsylvania, Allegheny City, Pa.
1889.

Jared W. Scudder, High School, Albany, N. Y. (117 Chestnut St.). 1897.

Dr. Helen M. Searles, Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburg, Pa. 1893.

Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y. 1888.

Prof. William J. Seelye, Wooster University, Wooster, O. 1888.

Dr. J. B. Sewall, 17 Blagden St., Boston, Mass. 1871.

Prof. T. D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (34 Hillhouse Ave.).
1873.

Prof. R. H. Sharp Jr., Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. 1897.

Prof. J. A. Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass. 1876.

Prof. Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (27 Hurlburt St.).
1881.

Prof. Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.

Prof. Edgar S. Shumway, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1885.

Prof. E. G. Sihler, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
1876.

Prof. M. S. Slaughter, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1887.

Prof. Charles Forster Smith, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1883.

Charles S. Smith, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.

Prof. Clement L. Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (64 Sparks St.).
1882.

- Miss Emily James Smith, Barnard College, New York, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1885.
Prof. Kirby F. Smith, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1897.
Leigh Richmond Smith, San Jose, Cal. 1896.
Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1886.
George C. S. Southworth, Salem, Col. Co., O. 1883.
Prof. Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
Prof. W. O. Sproull, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. (29 Mason St.). 1891.
Prof. Jonathan Y. Stanton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me. 1888.
Prof. R. B. Steele, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. 1893.
Prof. J. R. S. Sterrett, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1885.
Prof. F. H. Stoddard, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1890.
Dr. Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1881.
Prof. Marguerite Sweet, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1892.
Prof. Frank B. Tarbell, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1882.
Prof. Julian D. Taylor, Colby University, Waterville, Me. 1890.
Glanville Terrell, 17 Trowbridge Place, Cambridge, Mass. 1898.
Prof. J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (67 Sparks St.). 1871.
Prof. William E. Thompson, Hamline University, Hamline, Minn. 1877.
Prof. Fitz Gerald Tisdall, College of the City of New York, N. Y. (80 Convent Ave.). 1889.
Prof. Henry A. Todd, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1887.
Prof. H. C. Tolman, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1889.
Prof. Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y. 1885.
Edward M. Traber, State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo. 1896.
Prof. J. A. Tufts, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1898.
Prof. Milton H. Turk, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1896.
Prof. James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1898.
Dr. Frank L. Van Cleef, Ithaca, N. Y. 1887.
Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (121 High St.). 1869.
Dr. W. H. Wait, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1893.
Dr. John H. Walden, 13 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, Mass. 1889.
Prof. Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1895.
Dr. Alice Walton, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1894.
Dr. Edwin G. Warner, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1897.
Andrew McCorrie Warren, care of Brown, Shipley & Co., Founders' Court, London. 1892.
Henry C. Warren, 12 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass. 1880.
Prof. Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1874.
Dr. Winifred Warren, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1897.
Pres. William E. Waters, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1885.
C. R. Watson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.
Prof. Helen L. Webster, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1890.
Miss Mary C. Welles, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (33 Wall St.). 1898.
Prof. Elmer E. Wentworth, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1896.
Prof. Andrew F. West, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1886.

- Prof. J. H. Westcott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
 Prof. J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y. 1869.
 Prof. L. B. Wharton, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 1888.
 Albert S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn. 1871.
 Prof. Benjamin I. Wheeler, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (3 South Ave.). 1879.
 Prof. James R. Wheeler, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.
 Prof. G. M. Whicher, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1891.
 Dr. Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1886.
 Prof. John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (18 Concord Ave.). 1874.
 Prof. Henry C. Whiting, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1897.
 Vice-Chanc. B. Lawton Wiggins, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn. 1892.
 Prof. Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1884.
 Prof. Henry D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1898.
 Charles R. Williams, Indianapolis, Ind. 1887.
 Dr. George A. Williams, 88 King St., Providence, R. I. 1891.
 Dr. Harry Langford Wilson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1898.
 Dr. J. D. Wolcott, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1898.
 Prof. E. L. Wood, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1888.
 Prof. Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1884.
 Prof. Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1887.
 Dr. B. D. Woodward, New York, N. Y. (462 West Twenty-second St.). 1891.
 Prof. Ellsworth D. Wright, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis. 1898.
 Prof. Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.). 1883.
 Prof. John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (38 Quincy St.). 1874.
 Dr. Clarence H. Young, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (308 West 58th St.). 1890.
 Prof. A. C. Zenos, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill. 1889.

[Number of Members, 466.]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWNS)
 SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

- Albany, N. Y.: New York State Library.
 Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.
 Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Library
 Auburn, N. Y.: Theological Seminary.
 Austin, Texas: University of Texas Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.
 Berea, Madison Co., Ky.: Berea College Library.
 Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Library.
 Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.
 Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.
 Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Library.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College Library.
Buffalo, N. Y.: The Buffalo Library.
Burlington, Vt.: Library of the University of Vermont.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.
Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Library.
Chicago, Ill.: The Newberry Library.
Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.
Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Library.
Cincinnati, O.: Public Library.
Clermont Ferrand, France: Bibliothèque Universitaire.
Cleveland, O.: Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.
College Hill, Mass.: Tufts College Library.
Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Library.
Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.
Detroit, Mich.: Public Library.
Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Library.
Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Library.
Gambier, O.: Kenyon College Library.
Geneva, N. Y.: Hobart College Library.
Greencastle, Ind.: De Pauw University Library.
Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Library.
Iowa City, Ia.: Library of State University.
Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library.
Lincoln, Neb.: Library of State University of Nebraska.
Madison, Wis.: State Historical Society.
Marietta, O.: Marietta College Library.
Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Library.
Milwaukee, Wis.: Public Library.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Athenæum Library.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Library of the University of Minnesota.
Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Library.
Newton Centre, Mass.: Library of Newton Theological Institution.
New York, N. Y.: Astor Library.
New York, N. Y.: Library of Columbia University.
New York, N. Y.: Library of the College of the City of New York (Lexington Ave. and Twenty-third St.).
New York, N. Y.: Union Theological Seminary Library (700 Park Ave.).
Olivet, Eaton Co., Mich.: Olivet College Library.
Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Library Company of Philadelphia.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Mercantile Library.
Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Library.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.: Vassar College Library.
Providence, R. I.: Brown University Library.
Rochester, N. Y.: Rochester University Library.
Springfield, Mass.: City Library.
Tokio, Japan: Library of Imperial University.
University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.: University Library.

Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress.
 Washington, D. C.: Library of the Catholic University of America.
 Washington, D. C.: United States Bureau of Education.
 Waterbury, Conn.: Silas Bronson Library.
 Wellesley, Mass.: Wellesley College Library.
 Worcester, Mass.: Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing institutions, 65.]

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS THE TRANSACTIONS ARE
 ANNUALLY SENT, GRATIS.

American School of Classical Studies, Athens.
 American School of Classical Studies, Rome (No. 2, via Gaeta).
 British Museum, London.
 Royal Asiatic Society, London.
 Philological Society, London.
 Society of Biblical Archæology, London.
 Indian Office Library, London.
 Bodleian Library, Oxford.
 University Library, Cambridge, England.
 Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.
 Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.
 Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
 Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.
 Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.
 Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.
 Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.
 Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.
 University of Christiania, Norway.
 University of Upsala, Sweden.
 Stadsbiblioteket, Göteborg, Sweden.
 Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.
 Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.
 Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.
 Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.
 Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.
 Société Asiatique, Paris, France.
 Athénée Oriental, Louvain, Belgium.
 Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.
 Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.
 Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.
 Royal Saxon Academy of Sciences, Leipsic.
 Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.
 Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.
 Library of the University of Bonn.

Library of the University of Giessen.
Library of the University of Jena.
Library of the University of Königsberg.
Library of the University of Leipsic.
Library of the University of Tübingen.
Imperial Ottoman Museum, Constantinople.
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

[Number of foreign institutions, 41.]

TO THE FOLLOWING FOREIGN JOURNALS THE TRANSACTIONS ARE ANNUALLY
SENT, GRATIS.

Athenæum, London.
Classical Review, London.
Revue Critique, Paris.
Revue de Philologie, Paris.
Revue des Revues (Prof. J. Keelhoff, Rue de la petite ourse 14, Antwerp, Belgium).
Société de Linguistique, à la Sorbonne, Paris.
Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, Berlin.
Deutsche Litteraturzeitung, Berlin.
Indogermanische Forschungen (K. J. Trübner, Strassburg).
Literarisches Centralblatt, Leipsic.
Neue Philologische Rundschau, Gotha (F. A. Perthes).
Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, Berlin.
Rivista di Filologia, Turin (Ermanno Loescher).

[Total (466 + 65 + 41 + 1 + 13) = 586.]

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.
2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.
3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.
2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

(ORGANIZED 1869).

PRESIDENT.

1869-1870	William D. Whitney.
1870-1871	Howard Crosby.
1871-1872	William W. Goodwin.
1872-1873	Asahel C. Kendrick.
1873-1874	Francis A. March.
1874-1875	J. Hammond Trumbull.
1875-1876	Albert Harkness.
1876-1877	S. S. Haldeman.
1877-1878	B. L. Gildersleeve.
1878-1879	Jotham B. Sewall.
1879-1880	Crawford H. Toy.
1880-1881	Lewis R. Packard.
1881-1882	Frederic D. Allen.
1882-1883	Milton W. Humphreys.
1883-1884	Martin Luther D'Ooge.
1884-1885	William W. Goodwin.
1885-1886	Tracy Peck.
1886-1887	Augustus C. Merriam.
1887-1888	Isaac H. Hall.
1888-1889	Thomas D. Seymour.
1889-1890	Charles R. Lanman.
1890-1891	Julius Sachs.
1891-1892	Samuel Hart.
1892-1893	William Gardner Hale.
1893-1894	James M. Garnett.
1894-1895	John Henry Wright.
1895-1896	Francis A. March.
1896-1897	Bernadotte Perrin.
1897-1898	Minton Warren.
1898-1899	Clement L. Smith.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.¹

1869-1873	George F. Comfort.
1873-1878	Samuel Hart.
1878-1879	Thomas C. Murray.
1879-1884	Charles R. Lanman.
1884-1889	John Henry Wright.
1889-1899	Herbert Weir Smyth.

TREASURER.

1869-1873	J. Hammond Trumbull.
1873-1875	Albert Harkness.
1875-1883	Charles J. Buckingham.
1883-1884	Edward S. Sheldon.
1884-1889	John Henry Wright.
1889-1899	Herbert Weir Smyth.

¹ The offices of *Secretary* and *Treasurer* were united in 1884; and in 1891-1892 the title *Curator* was allowed to lapse.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

The following tables show the authors and contents of the volumes of Transactions thus far published : —

1869-1870. — Volume I.

- Hadley, J.: On the nature and theory of the Greek accent.
Whitney, W. D.: On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit.
Goodwin, W. W.: On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with *ἔπαις* and *οὐ μή*.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the best method of studying the North American languages.
Haldeman, S. S.: On the German vernacular of Pennsylvania.
Whitney, W. D.: On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language.
Lounsbury, T. R.: On certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible, etc.
Van Name, A.: Contributions to Creole Grammar.
Proceedings of the preliminary meeting (New York, 1868), of the first annual session (Poughkeepsie, 1869), and of the second annual session (Rochester, 1870).

1871. — Volume II.

- Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.
Allen, F. D.: On the so-called Attic second declension.
Whitney, W. D.: Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects.
Hadley, J.: On English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth.
March, F. A.: Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation.
Bristed, C. A.: Some notes on Ellis's Early English Pronunciation.

- Trumbull, J. Hammond: On Algonkin names for man.
Greenough, J. B.: On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek and Sanskrit.

Proceedings of the third annual session, New Haven, 1871.

1872. — Volume III.

- Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: Words derived from Indian languages of North America.
Hadley, J.: On the Byzantine Greek pronunciation of the tenth century, as illustrated by a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.
Stevens, W. A.: On the substantive use of the Greek participle.
Bristed, C. A.: Erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *such*.
Hartt, C. F.: Notes on the Lingoa Geral, or Modern Tupí of the Amazonas.
Whitney, W. D.: On material and form in language.
March, F. A.: Is there an Anglo-Saxon language?
March, F. A.: On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages.

Proceedings of the fourth annual session, Providence, 1872.

1873. — Volume IV.

- Allen, F. D.: The Epic forms of verbs in *dæ*.
Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.
Hadley, J.: On Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English.
Haldeman, S. S.: On the pronunciation of Latin, as presented in several recent grammars.
Packard, L. R.: On some points in the life of Thucydides.
Goodwin, W. W.: On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax.
March, F. A.: Recent discussions of Grimm's law.
Lull, E. P.: Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caladonia Bay, Darien.

Proceedings of the fifth annual session, Easton, 1873.

1874. — Volume V.

- Tyler, W. S.: On the prepositions in the Homeric poems.
Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.
Haldeman, S. S.: On an English vowel-mutation, present in *cag*, *keg*.
Packard, L. R.: On a passage in Homer's *Odyssey* (λ 81-86).
Trumbull, J. Hammond: On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting.
Sewall, J. B.: On the distinction between the subjunctive and optatives modes in Greek conditional sentences.
Morris, C. D.: On the age of Xenophon at the time of the Anabasis.
Whitney, W. D.: Φύσει or θέσει — natural or conventional?

Proceedings of the sixth annual session, Hartford, 1874.

1875. — Volume VI.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English consonant-mutation, present in *proof*, *prove*.

Carter, F.: On Begemann's views as to the weak preterit of the Germanic verbs.

Morris, C. D.: On some forms of Greek conditional sentences.

Williams, A.: On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action.

Sherman, L. A.: A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem "The Owl and the Nightingale."

Proceedings of the seventh annual session, Newport, 1875.

1876. — Volume VII.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: On *ei* with the future indicative and *εἰ* with the subjunctive in the tragic poets.

Packard, L. R.: On Grote's theory of the structure of the Iliad.

Humphreys, M. W.: On negative commands in Greek.

Toy, C. H.: On Hebrew verb-etymology.

Whitney, W. D.: A botanico-philological problem.

Goodwin, W. W.: On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents.

Humphreys, M. W.: On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the Algonkin verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On a supposed mutation between *l* and *u*.

Proceedings of the eighth annual session, New York, 1876.

1877. — Volume VIII.

Packard, L. R.: Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato.

Toy, C. H.: On the nominal basis on the Hebrew verb.

Allen, F. D.: On a certain apparently pleonastic use of *ὡς*.

Whitney, W. D.: On the relation of surd and sonant.

Holden, E. S.: On the vocabularies of children under two years of age.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.

Stickney, A.: On the single case-form in Italian.

Carter, F.: On Willmann's theory of the authorship of the Nibelungenlied.

Sihler, E. G.: On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis.

Whitney, W. D.: On the principle of economy as a phonetic force.

Carter, F.: On the Kurenberg hypothesis.

March, F. A.: On dissimilated gemination.

Proceedings of the ninth annual session, Baltimore, 1877.

1878. — Volume IX.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive.

Toy, C. H.: The Yoruban language.

Humphreys, M. W.: Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters.

Sachs, J.: Observations on Plato's Cratylus.

Seymour, T. D.: On the composition of the *Cynegeticus* of Xenophon.

Humphreys, M. W.: Elision, especially in Greek.

Proceedings of the tenth annual session, Saratoga, 1878.

1879. — Volume X.

Toy, C. H.: Modal development of the Semitic verb.

Humphreys, M. W.: On the nature of caesura.

Humphreys, M. W.: On certain effects of elision.

Cook, A. S.: Studies in Heliand.

Harkness, A.: On the development of the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.

D'Ooge, M. L.: The original recension of the *De Corona*.

Peck, T.: The authorship of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*.

Seymour, T. D.: On the date of the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus.

Proceedings of the eleventh annual session, Newport, 1879.

1880. — Volume XI.

Humphreys, M. W.: A contribution to infantile linguistic.

Toy, C. H.: The Hebrew verb-termination *un*.

Packard, L. R.: The beginning of a written literature in Greece.

Hall, I. H.: The declension of the definite article in the Cypriote inscriptions.

Sachs, J.: Observations on Lucian.

Sihler, E. G.: Virgil and Plato.

Allen, W. F.: The battle of Mons Graupius.

Whitney, W. D.: On inconsistency in views of language.

Edgren, A. H.: The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations.

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session, Philadelphia, 1880.

1881. — Volume XII.

Whitney, W. D.: On Mixture in Language.

Toy, C. H.: The home of the primitive Semitic race.

March, F. A.: Report of the committee on the reform of English spelling.

Wells, B. W.: History of the *a*-vowel, from Old Germanic to Modern English.

Seymour, T. D.: The use of the aorist participle in Greek.

Sihler, E. G.: The use of abstract verbal nouns in *-σις* in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirteenth annual session, Cleveland, 1881.

1882. — Volume XIII.

Hall, I. H.: The Greek New Testament as published in America.

Merriam, A. C.: Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek.

Peck, T.: Notes on Latin quantity.

Owen, W. B.: Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.

Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in English.

Whitney, W. D.: General considerations on the Indo-European case-system.

Proceedings of the fourteenth annual session, Cambridge, 1882.

1883. — Volume XIV.

- Merriam, A. C. : The Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria.
 Whitney, W. D. : The varieties of predication.
 Smith, C. F. : On Southernisms.
 Wells, B. W. : The development of the Ablaut in Germanic.
 Proceedings of the fifteenth annual session, Middletown, 1883.

1884. — Volume XV.

- Goodell, T. D. : On the use of the Genitive in Sophokles.
 Tarbell, F. B. : Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future life of the soul.
 Perrin, B. : The Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus.
 Peck, T. : Alliteration in Latin.
 Von Jagemann, H. C. G. : Norman words in English.
 Wells, B. W. : The Ablaut in High German.
 Whitney, W. D. : Primary and Secondary Suffixes of Derivation and their exchanges.
 Warren, M. : On Latin Glossaries. Codex Sangallensis, No. 912.
 Proceedings of the sixteenth annual session, Hanover, 1884.

1885. — Volume XVI.

- Easton, M. W. : The genealogy of words.
 Goodell, T. D. : Quantity in English verse.
 Goodwin, W. W. : Value of the Attic talent in modern money.
 Goodwin, W. W. : Relation of the *Πρόδρομοι* to the *Πρωταγώνιστοι* in the Attic *Βουλή*.
 Perrin, B. : Equestrianism in the Doloneia.
 Richardson, R. B. : The appeal to sight in Greek tragedy.
 Seymour, T. D. : The feminine caesura in Homer.
 Sihler, E. G. : A study of Dinarchus.
 Wells, B. W. : The vowels *e* and *i* in English.
 Whitney, W. D. : The roots of the Sanskrit language.
 Proceedings of the seventeenth annual session, New Haven, 1885.

1886. — Volume XVII.

- Tarbell, F. B. : Phonetic law.
 Sachs, J. : Notes on Homeric Zoölogy.
 Fowler, H. N. : The sources of Seneca de Beneficiis.
 Smith, C. F. : On Southernisms.
 Wells, B. W. : The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
 Fairbanks, A. : The Dative case in Sophokles.
 The Philological Society, of England, and The American Philological Association : Joint List of Amended Spellings.
 Proceedings of the eighteenth annual session, Ithaca, 1886.

1887. — Volume XVIII

- Allen, W. F.: The monetary crisis in Rome, A.D. 33.
Sihler, E. G.: The tradition of Cæsar's Gallic Wars, from Cicero to Orosius.
Clapp, E. B.: Conditional sentences in Aischylos.
Pease, E. M.: On the relative value of the manuscripts of Terence.
Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect.
Wells, B. W.: The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect. — *Addenda*.
Proceedings of the nineteenth annual session, Burlington, 1887.

1888. — Volume XIX

- Allen, W. F.: The *Lex Curiata de Imperio*.
Goebel, J.: On the impersonal verbs.
Bridge, J.: On the authorship of the Cynicus of Lucian.
Whitney, J. E.: The "Continued Allegory" in the first book of the Fairy Queene.
March, F. A.: Standard English: its pronunciation, how learned.
Brewer, F. P.: Register of new words.
Proceedings of the twentieth annual session, Amherst, 1888.

1889. — Volume XX

- Smyth, H. W.: The vowel system of the Ionic dialect.
Gudeman, A.: A new source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero.
Gatschet, A. S.: Sex-denoting nouns in American languages.
Cook, A. S.: Metrical observations on a Northumbrianized version of the Old English Judith.
Cook, A. S.: Stressed vowels in Ælfric's Homilies.
Proceedings of the twenty-first annual session, Easton, 1889.
Index of authors, and index of subjects, Vols. I.-XX.

1890. — Volume XXI

- Goodell, T. D.: The order of words in Greek.
Hunt, W. I.: Homeric wit and humor.
Leighton, R. F.: The Medicean Mss. of Cicero's letters.
Whitney, W. D.: Translation of the Katha Upanishad.
Proceedings of the twenty-second annual session, Norwich, 1890

1891. — Volume XXII

- Capps, Edw.: The Greek Stage according to the Extant Dramas.
Clapp, Edw. B.: Conditional Sentences in the Greek Tragedians.
West, A. F.: Lexicographical Gleanings from the *Philobiblon* of Richard de Bury.
Hale, W. G.: The Mode in the phrases *quod sciam*, etc.
Proceedings of the twenty-third annual session, Princeton, 1891.

1892. — Volume XXIII.

Whitney, W. D.: On the narrative use of imperfect and perfect in the Brāhmanas
Muss-Arnolt, W.: On Semitic words in Greek and Latin.

Humphreys, M. W.: On the equivalence of rhythmical bars and metrical feet.

Scott, Charles P. G.: English words which have gained or lost an initial consonant by attraction.

Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual session, Charlottesville, 1892.

1893. — Volume XXIV.

Sonnenschein, E. A.: The scientific emendation of classical texts.

Bréal, M.: The canons of etymological investigation.

Streitberg, W.: Ein Ablautproblem der Ursprache.

Osthoff, H.: Dunkles und helles *l* im Lateinischen.

Shorey, Paul: The implicit ethics and psychology of Thucydides.

Scott, C. P. G.: English words which have gained or lost an initial consonant by attraction (second paper).

Hale, W. G.: "Extended" and "remote" deliberatives in Greek.

Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual session, Chicago, 1893.

1894. — Volume XXV.

Knapp, Charles: Notes on the prepositions in Gellius.

Moore, F. G.: On *urbs aeterna* and *urbs sacra*.

Smith, Charles Forster: Some poetical constructions in Thucydides.

Scott, C. P. G.: English words which have gained or lost an initial consonant by attraction (third paper).

Gudeman, Alfred: Literary forgeries among the Romans.

Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual session, Williamstown, 1894.

1895. — Volume XXVI.

Bloomfield, M.: On Professor Streitberg's theory as to the origin of certain Indo-European long vowels.

Warren, M.: On the contribution of the Latin inscriptions to the study of the Latin language and literature.

Paton, James M.: Some Spartan families under the Empire.

Riess, Ernst: On ancient superstition.

Perrin, B.: Genesis and growth of an Alexander-myth.

Slaughter, M. S.: The *Acta Ludorum* and the *Carmen Saeculare*.

Scott, C. P. G.: The Devil and his imps: an etymological inquisition.

March, F. A.: The fluency of Shakespeare.

Proceedings of the special session, Philadelphia, 1894.

Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual session, Cleveland, 1895.

1896. — Volume XXVII.

Riess, E.: Superstition and popular beliefs in Greek tragedy.

Harkness, Albert Granger: Age at marriage and at death in the Roman Empire

Allinson, F. G. : On the accent of certain enclitic combinations in Greek.

Wright, John H. : The origin of sigma lunatum.

Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual session, Providence, 1896.

1897. — Volume XXVIII.

Brownson, C. L. : Reasons for Plato's hostility to the poets.

Sihler, E. G. : Lucretius and Cicero.

Bloomfield, M. : Indo-European notes.

Peck, Tracy : Cicero's hexameters.

Fairbanks, Arthur : On Plutarch's quotations from the early Greek philosophers.

March, F. A. : The enlargement of the English dictionary.

Collitz, H. : Traces of Indo-European accentuation in Latin.

Smyth, H. W. : Mute and liquid in Greek melic poetry.

Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual session, Bryn Mawr, 1897.

1898. — Volume XXIX.

Fay, E. W. : The origin of the gerundive.

Hempl, G. : Language-rivalry and speech-differentiation in the case of race-mixture.

Harry, J. E. : The omission of the article with substantives after οὗτος, δὲ, ἐκεῖνος in prose.

Ebeling, H. L. : The Admetus of Euripides viewed in relation to the Admetus of tradition.

Smyth, H. W. : Mute and liquid in Greek melic poetry (II.).

March, F. A. : Orthography of English preterits.

Wolcott, J. D. : New words in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirtieth annual session, Hartford, 1898.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application to the Secretary or to the Publishers until they are out of print.

Fifty separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions, ten of articles printed in the Proceedings, are given to the authors for distribution. Additional copies will be furnished at cost.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table : —

The Transactions for 1869 <i>and</i> 1870 form Vol. I.					The Trans. for 1884 form Vol. XV.				
The Trans. for 1871	"	"	II.		"	"	1885	"	XVI.
"	"	1872	"	III.	"	"	1886	"	XVII.
"	"	1873	"	IV.	"	"	1887	"	XVIII.
"	"	1874	"	V.	"	"	1888	"	XIX.
"	"	1875	"	VI.	"	"	1889	"	XX.
"	"	1876	"	VII.	"	"	1890	"	XXI.
"	"	1877	"	VIII.	"	"	1891	"	XXII.
"	"	1878	"	IX.	"	"	1892	"	XXIII.
"	"	1879	"	X.	"	"	1893	"	XXIV.
"	"	1880	"	XI.	"	"	1894	"	XXV.
"	"	1881	"	XII.	"	"	1895	"	XXVI.
"	"	1882	"	XIII.	"	"	1896	"	XXVII.
"	"	1883	"	XIV.	"	"	1897	"	XXVIII.
					"	"	1898	"	XXIX.

The price of these volumes is \$2.00 apiece, except Volumes XV., XX., and XXIII., for which \$2.50 is charged. The first two volumes will not be sold separately. A charge of fifty cents is made for the Index of Authors and Index of Subjects to Vols. I.-XX.

BINDING.

Back volumes will be bound in the style of this volume for twenty-five cents each by F. J. Barnard & Co., 17 Province St., Boston, Mass., provided at least twelve volumes are sent at a time, and the cost of transportation both ways is paid by the owner. All parcels should be plainly marked with the name and address of the sender, and the binders should be notified at the time the unbound volumes are sent in order that the sender may be identified.

REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions and Proceedings will be sold, until further notice, at a reduction of 20 %.

It is especially appropriate that American Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of American scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, apart from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.